

MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING AND WORK SESSION

November 20, 1997

Council Annex and 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 work session to order at 12:45 p.m.

A. REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN WORK SESSION

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that this session was not noted as a work session for action items. He explained that this work session was noticed as a session for non-action items. Action on amendments would take place during the Regular Council Meeting under the ordinance section.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated the work session would be begin with Chapter III and asked Councilor McLain for further comments on Chapter III.

Councilor McLain mentioned to the Metro Council members as well as the audience that Metro's Growth staff had done excellent job of going through the archives and reviewing all the materials collected since 1990 on the Regional Framework Plan. She noted that much of this material was available on tables outside the Council Chamber. She explained Chapters 3, 4, and 5 would be discussed today as well as Affordable Housing. Each of the Councilors was asked to discuss their amendments. Councilor McLain announced that she would begin the discussion with her amendments; each of the Councilors was then asked to bring forward their amendments.

Presiding Officer Kvistad requested that Michael Morrissey, Council Staff and Mark Turpel, Growth Management Department, and Charles Ciecko come forward to answer staff questions on the items under consideration. He then asked Mr. Morrissey for a thumbnail sketch of Chapter 3.

Mr. Morrissey stated that a summary of Chapter 3 had been heard at the last Council Work Session. He stated that this chapter included materials from Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) as well as some of the other advisory groups. It contained a recommendation for a Functional Plan to be completed at a later date with discussions of levels of services and other material.

Councilor Naito asked whether or not the Council was working off the Chapter III summary that was prepared by staff?

Councilor McLain stated that the easiest fashion for Metro Council to address these issues would be to begin the review by looking at the amendments that had been sponsored by the different Councilors. She continued that each Councilor had in front of them a single sheet that listed from which chapter each amendment was drawn and the Council sponsor.

Councilor Naito stated that she had asked for some language last week on the supplemental fund sources. She wondered if the discussion had moved beyond those specific issues.

Councilor McLain stated that the technical changes in the technical amendments had been assembled by Larry Shaw, Senior Assistant Counsel, and would arrive on the desk of each Councilor on December 4 or 11. She replied to Councilor Naito that it would be appropriate, if there is a technical amendment she wished to make certain that this be given to the Legal Counsel.

Councilor Naito stated that she was unsure of the current status of several old items. First, she had questions regarding the supplemental fund source, Charlie Ciecko had given her some answers on this item. However, was there a general nod test that Metro Council wanted some general funding language. The other issue was the ½ mile, 20% land issue. There was quite a bit of debate on the level of service (one of the amendments). She asked if these would be taken in order or had a resolution occurred on some of these issues already?

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that Metro Council needed to start at the beginning of these chapters with an overview from Councilor McLain and staff since not everyone was a member of the Growth Management Committee. Following that, a discussion would be held on general amendments to that chapter so that it might be placed in context for those people who were not up to speed on the exact specifics of what was before the Council. This would ensure fairness to all Metro Council members.

He reviewed the process: Councilor McLain would begin with a general discussion of the chapter, staff members would then offer their comments, it would then be brought back, once the chapter had been discussed and, finally, the series of amendments would be considered.

Councilor Morissette stated that in the previous work sessions, several issues were brought up. He asked about the legal review, an issue which he had brought up. He stated some of the items he had proposed regarding legal review had been dropped. He wondered if the proposals under discussion could meet the test of the current law. He had also asked Mr. Fregonese, before he left Metro, to leave with him a number of ideas on meeting the criteria and how it might be made a reasonable, understandable process by which a boundary might be moved into the Urban Reserves.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked Mr. Shaw if, in terms of the legal review, would something need to be done following amendments?

Mr. Shaw stated that the base draft had had legal review. The Office of General Counsel had not had time to make in depth reviews of each amendment. There might need to be a little legal review after what was to be adopted had been finalized. He offered his opinion that, generally, all was fine in this regard.

Councilor Morissette asked Mr. Shaw that if something obvious came to mind as Metro Council reviewed these amendments, to please make a comment.

Mr. Shaw answered him that, when invited, he would be glad to comment.

Councilor Morissette then asked about the process.

Mr. Fregonese replied that in terms of the process, things had not been worked out as to detail. He had worked out, with Executive Officer Mike Burton, that he would work under contract next year on the Urban Reserve process and finishing the Regional Framework Plan. He assured the

Council that it would be at least six months to finish the process and work on the process issue of Urban Reserve master planning and make the changes.

Councilor Morissette wondered if nothing foreclosed in this document today, would there be an opportunity for that to happen in the future.

Mr. Fregonese replied that this was not his opinion. There were some policies that were being discussed that actually helped set the policy framework. He further stated that he did not know the current status of these policies.

Mr. Shaw asked if Mr. Fregonese if 1.9 was being referred to?

Mr. Fregonese answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Shaw continued with information that 1.9 had been before the Growth Management Committee in concept and it had been discussed in concept at MTAC only and Amendment No. 8 adopted all of the 1.9 without the new portion that talked about streamlining the process so that streamlining could be discussed in the refinement period since there had not been enough discussion.

Mr. Fregonese stated that, based upon the last work session, Metro Council asked Growth Staff to come up with information in the Framework Plan that was going to support the master urban planning. Growth Management Department had come up with a launching point that, during the first part of the refinement process during the first part of next year, might be fleshed out.

Councilor McCaig stated that at the last work session, no votes were taken. Councilor Naito had done some rewriting and Metro Council had that copy of the chapters under review in hand. Councilor McLain had submitted several amendments and Councilor Morissette had also submitted amendments. These were not discussed. The Growth Management Committee started to get there and then broke into a public hearing. A small portion of these amendments were discussed. In the public hearing, some new issues came up. She stated that she saw one of Councilor McLain's new amendments, an issue dealing with something that came up in the hearing which was Chet Orloff's cultural piece. She continued by stating that there were other pieces that she did not see in the amendments. Did that now mean that it was too late to submit amendments on those issues as Metro Council discussed those chapters? Was there still a chance to submit amendments?

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that Metro Council would still try to do this since it appeared that the process would not be completed today as had been anticipated. For instance, an Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) review would be submitted after the first of the month. There would probably be at least one if not two more Metro Council meetings held on the Regional Framework Plan. At that time, members of Metro Council might bring up further amendments. Metro Council however, needed to be focused chapter by chapter in order to keep them in context.

Councilor McLain stated that her understanding of the process at this point was that unless a Councilor picked up one of those amendments and carried it that further amendments would not be brought forward?

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that this was correct.

Councilor McLain stated that this chapter was covered at the most recent work session. She turned to her first amendment, which had also been seen by Metro Council. She discussed Councilor McLain Amendment No. 3. This version, according to Mr. Cooper, was the best. Version 3.5.8 stated *Metro, in cooperation with the local government, shall develop a Functional Plan which establishes the criteria which local governments shall address in determining their level of service standard. The Functional Plan shall also establish region-wide goals for the provision of parks and open spaces and various urban design types identified in the 2040 Regional Growth Concept. The Functional Plan shall apply to the portion of the region within the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Reserves and within Metro's jurisdiction when Urban Reserves conceptual plans are approved.*

Councilor McLain explained that this addressed Councilor Naito's concerns regarding the ½ mile. In conversations heard both at Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) as well as in local jurisdictions, the ½ mile standard seemed to be an arbitrary standard. Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and Metro Growth Management Committee conversations suggested that it was more appropriate to talk about that level of service in the Functional Plan element and to have a bit more time for the local jurisdictions and park providers to be able to help with what that level of service meant.

Councilor Morissette stated that he did not see a difference between this amendment and the one he had but felt that both amendments said basically the same thing.

Councilor McLain answered that this amendment came out of the conversation at Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) which was a group of representative partners. She stated that it was supported by Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) because the Growth Management Committee took it to the level of a discussion of a level of service standard rather than an arbitrary level of standard.

Councilor Morissette then asked if Metro had the resources to do another Functional Plan.

Councilor McLain answered by recalling Councilman Charlie Hales' comment that we all knew that this particular Functional Plan was a guarantee and a commitment that Metro would deal with the regional aspect. Mr. Hales pointed out Metro must come up with an ability to figure out when these plans would be worked on, how much it would cost and in what order would this be done. Mr. Hales also indicated to Councilor McLain that Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) would help Metro with prioritizing a list of what was to be accomplished first.

Councilor Morissette suggested that this plan obligated Metro to do this.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated, in response to a question from Councilor McLain, that in terms of when Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) was discussing this item, it did not say urbanized any more on the amendments. What was the technical change to be made in this context and what effect did that have?

Councilor McLain asked Mr. Shaw to answer this query.

Mr. Shaw pointed out that what Presiding Officer Kvistad was focusing on was the actual amendment being proposed by Councilor McLain. Section 3.5.8 was in the basic document that was in front of each Metro Councilor. The amendment was to delete the words *when urbanized* which currently modified the term *Urban Reserve* and substituted the language *within Urban Reserves within Metro's jurisdiction when Urban Reserve conceptual plans are approved.* This

amendment had a narrow focus on the timing of when the Functional Plan was adopted and would apply to the Urban Reserve areas within Metro's jurisdiction because the functional planning authority Metro had did not extend beyond its jurisdictional boundaries.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that this applied directly to what was deleted and what was added. He stated that he had no deletions and the proposal made no sense.

Mr. Cooper stated that the Office of General Counsel put these drafts together quickly in order to ensure that everybody would have copies. A small technical glitch occurred and the words *when urbanized* should have been deleted after the word *Reserves* and before the addition of *within Metro's jurisdiction*.

Presiding Officer Kvistad replied that made sense and cleared up his confusion. Presiding Officer Kvistad then stated that this amendment would go on the table for consideration during Metro Council deliberations.

Councilor McLain continued with her second amendment in the present chapter regarding the cultural references in Chapters 3 and 7. There were a couple places where the Greenspace Staff and Charlie Ciecko had come up with language in places where they considered the wordage *cultural references* was appropriate. She stated that this amendment was already submitted to Metro Council under Chapter 7 under Environmental Education. This was not discussed because it came up in public testimony. If there was interest in *cultural* language being added in Chapter 3, she stated, it could be brought up at the next meeting of the Metro Growth Management Committee.

Councilor McCaig stated her interest in this language in Chapter 3.

Presiding Officer Kvistad instructed staff to draft an amendment for Chapter 3 which was under consideration. No other amendments were brought forward for discussion on Chapter 3.

Presiding Officer Kvistad then called for discussion of Chapter 4.

Councilor McCaig stated that she had an amendment drafted on Chapter 3. This amendment would not be submitted at the present time. At an Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting, a long discussion was undertaken between the members about being more directed to the local jurisdictions on allocating specific resources for Parks. Jim Zehren did a great deal of work on proposing some language which would have allowed Metro Council to include language which would direct local jurisdictions to set aside and the criteria by which local jurisdictions would decide which lands to set aside for parks. The conclusion was that Councilor McCaig liked Mr. Zehren's language. She had an amendment drafted for it which was perceived to be onerous by the local jurisdictions; that it was too directive.

Councilor McFarland responded to Councilor McCaig. She stated that she was always torn between the local jurisdictions saying 'let us do it ourselves; we know where and how to put it' or holding the big club over them saying 'you have to do it and you have to put it here'. After much consideration, Councilor McFarland stated that she had to come down on the side of telling local jurisdiction to do it but let them decide where and how.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated this to be the Nerf-Club approach.

Councilor Naito said that she had no problem with the policy of including open spaces and green spaces as Metro Council had done in transportation and housing issues but it sounded funny to say Metro Council would put transportation and housing up on this level; why did we not just put them on that level instead of mentioning that the previous were on a different standard. She suggested that there may policy reasons why Metro Council needed to use the exact language on a parity with jobs, housing and transportation issues.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that an amendment could be phrased just by removing *on a parity with jobs, housing and transportation*.

Councilor Naito asserted that this was what she had recommended. Targets were in the Framework Plan and there was intent of Metro Council to do that.

Councilor McLain responded to Councilor Naito that there was a lengthy conversation on this very topic at Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC). The language that Councilor Naito wished to remove was the very language that Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) wished to be left in. She strongly recommended that the language, as drafted, be left in and if there was a better grammatical way to say these things, she would be happy to come up with the technical language.

Councilor Naito stated her agreement with Councilor McLain's statement. She inquired as to the level of commitment in the language used at the present time. She offered her opinion that there were other ways to achieve the same result.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated his agreement with Councilor Naito.

Councilor McCaig stated that last week, Metro Council had not gone through the chapter. She stated that both she and Councilor Naito had made notes at that time and asserted her feeling that it would be appropriate, when Metro Council was done with the amendments, to ask questions about the chapter.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he had hoped to go through the chapter first, discuss all questions, and then do amendments. He stated, however, that this would be the time to discuss the chapter along with the questions and changes.

Councilor McCaig then continued that Councilor McFarland and Councilor Naito would remember what she had struggled with the master plan for parks. She referred the Councilors to the Identification and Inventory of the Regional System section. She stated that she as well as Councilors McFarland and Naito made notes on the draft that would be discussed.

Councilor Morissette questioned if this was *the Identification Inventory of Regional System*? If so, this was to be found on p. 89.

Councilor McCaig stated that this was indeed the section on which she wished to make comments. In the forthcoming discussion with Oxbow Park as well with other parks coming on line, Metro Council was looking for a place. Councilor McLain had said that place would be in Chapter 3. Emphasis would to be placed on this section in terms of a review of the regional system. If emphasis was placed on parks, etc., in Metro's region as well as in Clark County, these parks would be overloaded people at the expense of keeping master plans, being done one at a time now Councilor McCaig then restated her point – her concern was that Metro Council was taking the parks one at a time, never taking them in a total review of the region and the needs

of the entire region. Metro Council was reviewing them only with reference to needs of the specific park under consideration at a given time. What was being found was that Oxbow, for instance, was doing a nice job on keeping the quality of experience in quality way but nothing was done with the growth the region was already experiencing. That was not part of the discussion. The burden on new parks was going to be increasing and a different quality in different parks would soon be noticed. The only issue addressed in this context was Chapter 3. The rest of the equation was not discussed.

Councilor McLain stated that on P. 89, the newly-drafted text read *re-evaluate protection priorities established in the Metropolitan Green Space master plan*. The word 're-evaluate' seemed to be where that would go. At the first bullet in the November 16 revision seemed to be the proper place to position any strengthening of language for recognizing the fact that because of the different density and the different status quo of population, that might be a piece that should re-evaluated in the prioritizing.

Councilor McCaig then stated that the reason that did not fit for her was that she believed Metro had a wonderful emphasis on the protection element and she did not wish to weaken it at all. As these master plans went through the process, it was discovered that there was no part of the process which brought in the growing population and the specific recreational needs. She wished to ensure that the growth accommodated both the park's growth and capacity of the parks to accommodate both growth as well as the protection of the natural resources.

Councilor McLain asked Councilor McCaig for specific language in this regard.

Councilor McCaig replied that she did not have an amendment. She inquired, however, if the foregoing was the intent of that language and, if not, she wished to make this concept the intent.

Councilor McLain stated that, in her opinion, this was the intent, but if Councilor McCaig wished to add language at this point, that would be appropriate.

Councilor McCaig said that she and Councilor McFarland might have comments on this issue since they had discussed it in the Metro Council Regional Facilities committee.

Councilor Naito stated that she was wondering, as she read the language regarding levels of service, if we might not need additional language, since we were trying to link the development of new parks to the 2040 Concept. She was totally supportive of that. She continued that Metro was looking for greater connections between Transportation Planning and park planning as well as other sorts of density. They were, however, inconsistent with other policies and terms of transportation planning secondary to the fact that they were relying upon automotive transit. She stated that she was looking for some kind of language regarding the linkage of Metro's master planning process between the growth issues and policy changes in terms of the direction of land use planning and transportation planning.

Presiding Officer Kvistad recommended that there be a small amount of language regarding existing park facilities and evaluation of potential sites of recreational capacity and analysis.

Councilor Naito stated that she was talking about the master planning process of either adding capital improvements or any kinds of changes of that nature to existing master planning.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he was attempting to find some language that would address this.

Councilor McCaig stated that it would be an excellent idea to do park facilities, recreational capacity as well as an analysis of park service needs, melding them with 2040 goals.

Presiding Officer Kvistad suggested that this item be drafted as a technical adjustment and could then be considered for action since this appeared to be technical in nature.

Councilor Naito then stated that the rest of her items were done more in terms of drafting issues rather than policy changes of the issues.

Presiding Officer Kvistad then stated that more of Councilor Naito's issues could be handled at committee level under the heading of technical adjustments to language so long as there was no change of intent in the items in the chapter.

Presiding Officer Kvistad then called for Chapter 4 and called upon Councilor McLain for an overview.

Councilor McLain proceeded to sketch out details of Chapter 4 which dealt with water sources and water storage. The Metro Charter required these parameters to be addressed by Metro Council. An extensive review of Chapter 4 had been undertaken by both Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC), Growth Management Department Staff, Metro Transportation Advisory Committee (MTAC) as well as the Regional Water Consortium Group. It had borne the brunt of thorough discussion. The language that still had unresolved language issues included additional changes in the storm water section proposed by Clackamas County. Those were discussed at the most recent Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) meeting. Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) consensus was that these issues would be better off discussed during the Functional Plan discussions by Metro Council. Those issues had subsequently been resolved. At this point, Councilor McLain proposed an additional amendment, Council McLain amendment No. 4. Was there a need for additional comments pertaining to this chapter?

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked if there were more comments at the time from Metro Council on Chapter 4 or amendments to be presented for discussion? As there were none, Presiding Officer Kvistad issued a call for amendments on Chapter 5. As there were none, Presiding Officer Kvistad called upon Councilor McLain for an overview of Chapter 5.

Councilor McLain pointed out that the Regional Natural Hazards chapter (Chapter 5) had been discussed at the most recent Work Session. Councilor McFarland and Councilor Naito had brought up some man made and natural hazards issues. These included the portion dealing with radioactivity and the Columbia River. This chapter, in the realm of natural hazards, dealt with mud slides, flood issues, flood mitigation.

Councilor Morissette questioned intent. He stated that he did not read anywhere in this chapter that slopes were excluded from being able to be built on. Rather, they needed to meet the code requirements to make them safe.

Mr. Shaw explained that in no part of Chapter 5 was there anything that was in a Functional Plan, a requirement, or a limitation on the density inventory and other parts of the Functional Plan. Chapter 5 did not address density calculations or any buildable lands inventory.

Mr. Turpel added that Policy 5.3.2 did not take into regard steeply slopes areas; rather it was regarding land slide areas.

Councilor Morissette agreed.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked for further comments on Chapter 5.

Councilor McLain stated her Amendment No. 6. This included area 52.3 which was included in McLain amendments. It stated that *while construction of levies and flood to mitigate flood hazards have been historically reviewed as a legitimate flood mitigation measure, the Portland Metropolitan region recognizes that flooding is a natural phenomenon which is necessary in maintaining the health of stream and river systems. Avoidance of flood plain development and other non-structure flood mitigation measures shall be favored over levee and dike structural flood mitigation techniques...* Discussion at Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) indicated that Metro Council should realize that flooding was natural. Metro Council should recognize the fact that putting in those types of constructions was not the best way. The best way was not to build in flood plains. The point of this amendment was to recognize this fact.

Councilor Naito stated that most would agree with Councilor McLain's statement. She continued, however, that if there was development such as towns and cities along a stream and river system, that flooding was due to the type of human development that had occurred. She was uncertain if flood mitigation was actually good for either the fish or the streams. She stated her uncertainty of this particular measure.

Councilor Morissette stated that Councilor Naito had just discussed his point. He stated his belief that this proposal was a mistake.

Councilor McLain stated her belief that contained in this discussion were couple different issues. She asserted that some flooding would take place no matter what was done and no matter how carefully planning was done, some flooding would naturally occur. Some dikes and levees were now in place because building had occurred in the naturally flooding areas. It was important to acknowledge the fact that there were places within the region where that type of structure was already being used to mitigate some of the issues and the harms of the flooding. We were indicating, with the aforementioned sentence, that Metro Council did not believe that was the wisest choice. Metro Council wished to go on record in the Regional Framework Plan demonstrating that kind of construction was the first choice but also that Metro Council recognized that sometimes it may have to happen. Councilor McLain called upon Mr. Fregonese for his thoughts and comments.

John Fregonese stated his belief that the topic at the heart of this discussion was the issue of putting in a levee and a dike system to reclaim flood plain lands for development. The distinction that Metro Council was using, according to Mr. Fregonese, was that levees and dikes ought to be used to protect existing developed areas that were in the flood plain from flooding. He stated, it was his belief, that if that was the difference, there was a way around it. This would be to simply say levees and dikes should be used to protect existing, developed areas from flooding but not to reclaim vacant flood plain lands for development. Vacant flood plains should then be used as areas used for flood storage. Those were the areas that were good to flood and maintain the river and stream systems.

Councilor Morissette stated his belief that Metro's Urban Growth Boundary was built such that in any one of these areas someone would be flooded if their house was near. He did not see any large, vacant spots available. He suggested that excluding one area over another would be a

mistake. It was good to discourage reclaiming flood plains to be building on flood plains but was that legal?

Mr. Fregonese stated that this was possible and legal. Under Title III it became harder but, on the other hand, reflecting policy into Title III was not desirable. The policy adopted in the resolution was Metro Council would rather expand the Urban Growth Boundary than reclaim flood plains. Proposals had been made for vacant areas in flood plains to be reclaimed for development in the Urban Growth Boundary.

Councilor Morissette wondered if flood plains were not out of bounds for development.

Mr. Fregonese stated that he preferred this not to be policy but according to federal law, all that needed to be done, according to federal law was to fill the flood plain or put in place a levee. Federal law adopted by most cities applied everywhere; consequently, approximately 60% of Louisiana was within flood plain areas. Citizens there had historically demonstrated that they held different ideas about this matter than we here in the west did. Here in Oregon it was imperative that governing agencies needed to be specific about what was intended to do about levees because FEMA regulations and standards did not prohibit development in flood plains.

Councilor Naito stated her agreement with Metro's policies regarding levee and dike construction.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that the language described by Mr. Fregonese, regarding the difference between reclaiming flood plain for development and protecting urban environment would work for him. The policy point described by Mr. Fregonese would work for him. He stated that he was sensitive to flooding issues since a great deal of his district ran along the Tualatin River where much of the flooding of the past few years had been beside the Tualatin River.

Councilor Washington told Councilor McLain that he approved of Mr. Fregonese's language and that it made sense to him. Councilor Washington asked if there were other variables in this equation?

Councilor McLain commented to Councilor Washington was that Metro Council was trying to address the issue that Presiding Officer Kvistad was discussing which was that there were areas that needed some of this protection that were already built on. What Mr. Fregonese pointed out was that Metro must not encourage that kind of building in the future. This was why that last sentence was so important. She further suggested that Mr. Shaw and Mr. Fregonese work together and come up with language that captured the intent of this section.

Councilor Washington wondered why building in a flood plain or even trying to recover it for development in the future made sense?

Councilor McLain replied to Councilor Washington that Beaverton and Tualatin were both build in flood plains. She stated that building upon these flood plains should not have happened in the past but it did. Metro Council must acknowledge the fact that these areas would need some form of protection. Metro Council had tried to wed those two ideas and there was much discussion at Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee (WRPAC). Councilor McLain stated that she would be happy to get new language to clarify this situation.

Councilor Naito stated that she had issues with the first sentence in this language. By saying that these areas had historically been viewed as legitimate, there still may be times when they were necessary. She also did not believe in a human-developed environment, that flooding might actually be a good phenomena for the health of rivers and streams. She stated that she did not believe this to be true anymore.

Presiding Officer Kvistad added that it was not all that great for houses.

Councilor McLain stated she had several reasons to disagree. She took specific exception to the clause which stated that flooding was not necessarily beneficial to the environment. There existed reasons why flooding was important.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that Metro Council was now beyond that.

Councilor McLain continued to state her belief that she did not believe that if that was not some of the most important part of the conversations Metro Council had had, then it would not have been in that language.

Councilor Naito then stated that she would withdraw with respect to Councilor McLain's point.

Presiding Officer Kvistad announced that there was a general level of comfort from the approach that Mr. Fregonese took, particularly with his explanation of the 'built' versus the 'unbuilt' environment.

Councilor McLain stated that Mr. Cooper might suggest some language on this issue.

Presiding Officer Kvistad emphasized that he did not want to micromanage language; it was possible to have it redrafted and have it brought back when Metro Council moved into actual amendments in the ordinance.

General Counsel Cooper stated that Mr. Fregonese had handed him an additional sentence that addressed what he had stated for the record. He stated that it would be typed up as McLain amendment No. 6a.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that was an excellent idea and called upon Councilor Morissette.

Councilor Morissette stated that he gave nod approval to some of Councilor Naito's amendments as long as they protected the built environment with the exception that they protected sewer plants since when one of these properties flooded, it could result in a large mess.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that since an A-version of this was being drafted and interchanged before the Metro Council meeting, this issue should be tabled until that time. Presiding Officer Kvistad called for other amendments or comments about this chapter. Since no comments were forthcoming, Presiding Officer Kvistad called for Chapter 1 – Housing.

Councilor McLain stated that Metro was still waiting for Clark County to review language in Chapter 6 by Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

Presiding Officer Kvistad called for an overview of Chapter 1 by Councilor McLain.

Councilor McLain gave an overview of Chapter 1. One of the elements that had been determined to be important was the issue of affordable housing. Councilor Washington had been working on this item for the last three to four months. A packet had been provided for Metro Council with a resolution. Councilor McLain stated that it was her hope that as this resolution was reviewed today that a vote might be taken on this date on that resolution and that the resolution might be written into the Regional Framework Plan language which may be brought back to the next work session. She suggested that Councilor Washington discuss this resolution.

Presiding Officer Kvistad noted that ten amendments were attached to this Chapter and must be reviewed before full council consideration.

Councilor McLain noted a memo from Councilor Washington to Metro Council. She stated that before an amendments would make sense, the base resolution should be thoroughly discussed.

Councilor Washington stated that the big amendment package contained the resolution under question. This was the latest copy as of the morning of this date.

Presiding Officer Kvistad suggested that this work session begin with the affordable housing issues. He noted that the affordable housing issues were highly controversial. When this item came to Regular Metro Council Meeting today, it would require a suspension of the rules in order to consider it for as an action item on this date. If the rules were not suspended during the discussion item at Metro Council level, then the item would move to the December 4 agenda and would be discussed at that time.

Councilor McCaig stated that she had no amendments to Chapter 1 as it was written. She stated that she would wait until the housing resolution, which, depending on how it was adopted, would be incorporated into Chapter 1 so next week or the week after, Metro Council would not have a resolution any more but instead would be dealing with Chapters 1 – 8. She continued that her amendments were specific to the resolution with the understanding that the resolution, once adopted, would be immediately incorporated into Chapter 1 and then Chapter 1 would then be before Metro Council for further discussion, amendments, and changes. The options for changes by vote of Metro Council members would accordingly have been narrowed down.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that understanding was correct. Metro Council would at this time have an overview of the pending item to be followed by general discussion of the items of change to that resolution.

Councilor McCaig stated that she was not trying to be difficult. She stated that she merely needed to see the resolution.

Councilor Naito stated she thought the record at this point should reflect the fact that everyone was being naughty.

Presiding Officer Kvistad then called upon Councilor Washington for an overview of his resolution.

Councilor Washington stated that Metro Council members had been advised on what had been going on. It had appeared to him that stronger language needed to be used on the issue of affordable housing. Accordingly, a conference was called of housing advocates from the region as well as the homebuilders. He had had a draft resolution prepared at that time. The majority and minority recommendations from Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) were

incorporated into that resolution that was presented to that committee. After that, Councilor Washington gave the resolution to the committee and had the group work up the resolution for that day. A facilitator was called in and the committee went through each step of it, changes to this resolution as well as the Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Committee. Every single idea received by this group was given to legal staff who worked to include all these ideas. Councilor Washington stated that this was an excellent job of people pulling together.

Presiding Officer Kvistad thanked Councilor Washington and asked for specifically detailed questions on this resolution.

Councilor McLain stated that there a number of amendments on this resolution. She suggested that either one of the legal staff explained these amendments or other council members could ask specific questions regarding amendments on this resolution.

Presiding Officer Kvistad suggested an overview by legal staff of what was before Metro Council and requested that Mr. Shaw present this overview

Councilor Naito stated that as Metro Council went through this process, Councilor Washington and others had added suggestions that were not in the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) recommendation. Perhaps those should be highlighted in the discussion.

Mr. Shaw said that the “whereas” statements gave the history of what had been accomplished in this area in the past. He reminded Metro Council that there had been an objective 17 about Fair Share Housing since the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) were first adopted and that some requirements for affordable housing had been placed in the Metro Code on Urban Reserve planning when the Urban Reserves were adopted in March 1997. A series of recommendations of many of the policies dealt with in more detail here in Title 7, Section 2 of the Oregon urban growth Functional Plan that was adopted in November, 1996. There were a number of resolves consequently.

Resolve Number 1 almost repeated the Functional Plan policies that were in the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan that related to affordable housing so that they could be considered with the rest of the affordable housing policies altogether and might be viewed as one set of policies. There were three items. People were doing them at the present time so it was good to remember that local governments were doing this now – a minimum density standard in all zones allowing residential use; allowing at least one accessory within any detached single-family dwelling which had caused some local governments to review their whole approach to accessory dwellings including Portland which had a pending expansion of their accessory dwelling approach to include detached units. Third, increased housing densities and light rail station communities and corridors which increased the opportunity for smaller, more affordable units.

Number 2 was an item which was first discussed in a Growth Management Committee meeting several months ago. This was the idea of Metro linking regional transportation funding to affordable housing policies and the achievement of affordable housing targets to the extent allowed by law. The phrase *extent allowed by law* recognized the fact that when you get into transportation funding, the interaction of state and federal laws which overlays in terms of regional policy. This information was provided as a general statement for the Regional Framework Plan; the details would have to be worked out with Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) as well as Metro Council and most likely in consultation to ensure that Metro stayed clear on the extent allowed by law from everybody’s point of view. This was a general statement of that policy.

Number 3 was the Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Committee (AHTAC). A resolution was placed before the Council. The list of representatives had been increased secondary to the latest version of that resolution; there were approximate members on the current list. Mr. Shaw based this information on what had come to his attention since the draft resolution was first put out. Many recommendations had been received for additional members of this group.

Number 4 explained Mr. Shaw, contained wording changes in the Fair Share statement came from a variety of sources. The first change came from language suggested by Mayor Gussie McRobert at the Growth Management Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 18, 1997. As she intended, it did not change the thrust of the language but it did give the proper relationship between the Regional Framework Plan policy which was not a target but rather a policy and the numerical targets that were intended in the Functional Plan performance standard, when it was developed, for addition to the Functional Plan as a part of a new Functional Plan.

That was a more detailed statement of the Fair Share policies that were already incorporated within Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) objective 17 and had been in there for some time. They reflected the use of the Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Committee (AHTAC) to establish the fair share targets which needed a significantly greater amount of work. This seemed to a unanimous statement from both Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC), Metro Transportation Advisory Committee (MTAC) as well as citizens who had testified before the Growth Management Committee as well as the full Council.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked of Mr. Shaw where to locate the fair share clause.

Mr. Shaw replied that there was a definition of fair share in the repeat of the Regional Urban Growth Goals and Objectives (RUGGOs) within Policy 1.3 in Objective 17 within the document currently in hand. It was not a definitive statement but discussed options for developing a fair share strategy. The current objective was to develop a fair share strategy. The policy under discussion was more specific saying that fair share strategy should be in the form of jurisdictional fair share targets and the actual numerical targets and the approach to those numerical targets was left for the Functional Plan except for the restatement of the items that were in that RUGGO objective; items such as considerations for affordable and the jobs housing balance. Mr. Shaw pointed out a substantive addition that came from Mayor McRobert proposals in the Growth Management Committee. This policy stated that those *targets will include consideration of both existing and future needs for affordable housing*. That had been a big issue in Metro Transportation Advisory Committee (MTAC) Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and came from Gresham's activities of late. That was a substantive policy statement. The second paragraph was intended to reflect a restatement of the general objective in portion 1.3. This language accordingly must be blended.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that although it was time for Metro Council to convene its general Thursday meeting at this time, Council would finish this presentation at this time and take a short break after the work session discussions. He then requested Mr. Shaw continue his presentation.

Mr. Shaw stated that fair share policies and targets were something that did come up from Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and were in both of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) majority and minority recommendations.

Number 5 concerned itself with the policy regarding having a region-wide requirement that every city and county have a replacement ordinance, the purpose being ensuring that existing, affordable units lots to demolition or nonresidential development would be replaced. That was the general policy. There was a discussion at Metro Transportation Advisory Committee (MTAC) today on just how the approach could differ between a large central city, a medium-size city and suburban areas. Peggy Lynch explained to us that there were no more suburbs but there were different approaches that would apply. Metro Council's model ordinance perhaps would not be "one size fits all" but might have some alternatives within the document. This was just the general policy to do that and to do that as soon as possible. The policy here was to try to work on this as soon as possible to see if it might fit in the Growth Management Functional Plan ahead of a completion of a complete affordable housing Functional Plan. Metro Council had made a commitment to have a Technical Advisory Committee; that TAC would work on a separate, affordable housing functional plan and a list of items would be part of these considerations. This issue was questioned at Metro Transportation Advisory Committee (MTAC) on this date since it might be too ambitious because of the need of different approaches for different sizes of cities.

Number 6 was a statement that there would be an affordable Functional Plan and that was in addition to making a commitment to have a Technical Advisory Committee. Both Mayor McRobert and the Home Builders Association urged that Metro step up and recognize that in order to do fair share targets effectively and Metro must centralize and monitor the supply and delivery and affordable housing in order to do a good job with those fair share targets. This issue was discussed in an Metro Transportation Advisory Committee (MTAC) morning meeting on this date according to Mr. Shaw.

Councilor McCaig asked why the specific affordable housing targets were deleted? This question was directed to either Councilor Washington or Mr. Shaw.

Mr. Shaw replied that there was more specific language in Number 7.

Councilor McLain stated that Mr. Shaw did not mention that Growth Management Committee has heard some comments about the bullet that said provisions for seeking region-wide development and approvals in legislation as one of the menu that had gotten some comments. Councilor McLain concluded by stating she would bring forward an amendment on this topic later.

Mr. Shaw then continued with Number 7. The first sentence was a statement that defined generally what mandatory inclusionary zoning was. There had been much discussion as well as different uses of that phrase. It stated that Metro's policy was that this was an important and legitimate tool if done region-wide and used with density bonuses. It was a statement of approval of regional mandatory inclusionary zoning used with incentives as a policy tool. The subsections under this modified that statement or discussed how to implement that statement. The succeeding statement was the thrust of all of Number 7. *Metro shall seek immediate increases in production of affordable housing by implementing all of its regional affordable housing policies.* This referred to all the policies in this resolution. The subs under Number 7 were really a series of steps.

Councilor Naito wondered if it would be accurate to state that this was new language we were dealing with; ideas that had been brought forward since Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC).

Mr. Shaw answered Councilor Naito in the affirmative that all of the items he had discussed until now fell into this category. He cautioned, however, that some of the items he would be discussing later on this day, might have arrived either in the majority or minority report.

Councilor McCaig stated that she wished to ensure, as Metro Council in work session this date, moved from A to G, that she understood the context in which discussion was conducted; she stated that this was not a recommendation for inclusionary zoning but rather a voluntary effort with a component of specific ideas related. At no point in No. 7 did it ever require inclusionary zoning. Only at one point did it even suggest that at the end of 1998 – if it did not work, Metro Council would reconsider it. She termed Councilor Washington’s memo at the beginning of this discussion to be quite important. Metro Council should not go into this discussion with constituents assuming that these things were being required. Metro Council did not take the step forward with inclusionary zoning or postponing a decision on it and even then Metro Council was not requiring it – Metro Council was affording the opportunity for it to be considered again.

Councilor Naito stated, for the record, with respect to No. A that it was a mandatory requirement region-wide requirement that while density bonuses were allowed in the mixed use areas for individuals, it was a mandatory change for the jurisdictions involved and so it was a type of hybrid.

Councilor Morissette stated that he had read the comments and argued his exception to those comments. He asserted that in his opinion, in much too short a period of time, for any real efforts to be made in this regard, would anything be able to accomplish that. By voting for this, he believed, Metro Council was voting for inclusionary zoning twelve months from now if Metro Council did indeed vote for this proposal. He stated this comments were contrary to what Councilor McCaig just stated.

Councilor McFarland wondered what kind of time frame should be put in this issue that would be a reasonable goal for local governments so they would know that they must begin their zoning studies?

Councilor Morissette stated that he would not take the course that Metro Council was currently taking. He would choose another, completely different course. He stated that the incentives were the good part of these recommendations, it would take a while for that to show. He stated that when he was planning a community, three or perhaps more years were required to make them happen. If, today, Metro Council were to change the codes to allow an incentive-based program to create more affordable housing, it would be unlikely that much of that would be seen by the end of 12 months. It might take as much as 12 month to get the incentives approved let alone see the housing get built. Councilor Morissette stated that he would steer away from inclusionary zoning in that paragraph and, additionally, terms to see how performance with incentives performed after a three-to five year review of that situation.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that if 1998-2000 would not work, would an amendment be required?

Councilor Morissette stated that he felt that he did not have the vote to modify this. He merely wished to put his feelings on the record concerning these issues.

Presiding Officer Kvistad then asked if a two-year study period was going to pass?

Councilor Morissette stated that there was a philosophical difference.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that he was on Councilor Morissette's side of this matter.

Councilor Morissette asked Presiding Officer Kvistad what part of three to five years did he not hear?

Presiding Officer Kvistad then stated that apparently adding another year from 1998-2000 would make no difference.

Councilor Morissette stated that three to five years were framed, perhaps some results with some zoning changes implemented with the next twelve months to accomplish this. He went on to state that he would not even be in support of that with the term inclusionary zoning.

Councilor McCaig stated that this was an extremely important discussion because of the differences that were highlighted within it, particularly between Councilor Morissette and herself. Upon reading it, Councilor McCaig found that she could support a variety of the differences – the reduction of the public subsidy piece was good; but, in fact, she believed that Metro Council has dodged the question. In fact, Metro Council had postponed making the decision about whether we supported inclusionary zoning or not.

Presiding Officer Kvistad stated that this was a good thing.

Councilor Morissette stated that Councilor McCaig was setting this up to happen twelve months from now which was exactly why he made his original comments. It could be done now, if Metro Council agreed, but he stated that he did not support it now or even in twelve months.

Councilor McCaig stated that was an important fact for people to remember. As Metro Council discussed inclusionary zoning, there were a number of elements she strongly supported. However, in portion F, it stated *that region-wide mandatory inclusionary zoning and other Functional Plan requirements, based upon the zoning approach developed by Metro shall be considered*. The word 'considered' was one of those legal words she would be happy to debate. It was the difference between the interpretation and definition of words such as 'may' and 'shall' when under consideration for language being considered for Functional Plan implementation at the end of 1998. All of these wonderful criteria had been established and put in place, if it worked or not at the end of a given period of time, it would be considered again. Her amendment dealt directly with that language which would change it with terminology such as 'be required' or 'it would be included at the end of the current year' rather than the delay. The distinction between Councilor Morissette and Councilor McCaig was that Councilor Morissette read this portion as though he believed this to be very restrictive and that it was a done deal. Councilor McCaig read this portion and was concerned that Metro Council postponed the discussion and would be comfortable with all the other elements of this piece if, at the end of 1998, Metro Council did not consider it again. Metro Council, rather, imposed.

Councilor McFarland had a question for Councilor McCaig: Did her amendment change the time frame? Did it still say one year?

Councilor McCaig answered Councilor McFarland in the affirmative. She continued with further information. She believed this decision, as times went by, would only become more difficult. As Metro Council saw the increasing pressure and development, this decision did not, the longer it was postponed, become easier. This was the place to begin to make the decision about whether Metro Council was destined to take this step or not. As you push it out further and further, the

momentum would most likely push in the opposite direction inasmuch as the stakes became higher every year, the profits were more available.

Presiding Officer Kvistad interrupted and stated that the debate would have, if it came before Metro Council.

Mr. Shaw stated that Section A was a mandatory requirement for cities to amend their ordinances and allow a density bonus incentive of at least 25% for permanent affordability units (sixty years was the definition of permanent affordability units, in most places this was used) and the new idea came up in Growth Management Committee yesterday that an alternative to that might be a shared equity program. This was a program where, if someone did sell, they then must share back some of the proceeds to the program to keep the program going. This was a Montgomery idea that was part of what was called 'inclusionary housing' in Montgomery County that was discussed during the conference.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked if this said, "we are going to make affordable housing available" what ever form this might take. Then we would tell members of the public that got the mortgage and signed up for it, that if they sold their house, they then must give back part of the equity to some governmental entity for the program itself rather than the family be able to keep the equity in the home they were buying.

Mr. Shaw stated that this was close. A shared equity program was an alternative to keep units affordable. In other words, part of this program was a bonus and part of this program was something you did to get the bonus. For a developer to get the bonus with a 25% increase in density, some land for some free land units, the developer must do some percentage, 10% to 20% of the units as affordable. If you did not have some sort of limitation upon this, then someone could purchase an affordable unit at a reduce price, perhaps even subsidized by some agency who was a nonprofit provider of affordable housing and in two years the purchaser could turn around and get a profit on that house that might have come partially from subsidies. All this said was that if you were a local government and you were doing a program like this you could either say "those units have to stay affordable for sixty years" or you could conceivably say, "we'll set up some form of shared equity program that worked well and was equitable." That was all it said. This was a suggestion from a nonprofit developer of affordable housing.

The exemption at the last part of Section A came from the City of Gresham at the Growth Management Committee on Tuesday. There was a proposal from Councilor Naito to make that language more explicit. Section B talked about developing a voluntary zoning approach consistent with Oregon land use laws and 2040 growth design concepts including architectural consistency. This was a recognition that there was no cookie cutter or model. This wording said to go and create that as a voluntary approach. The home builders were absolutely opposed to mandatory inclusionary zoning. They would not come to meetings where that was the only subject. They had said the voluntary inclusionary zoning was something they had said, if it was voluntary and had incentives, they would consider. The idea was to get a zoning approach that would put you on a different page than the Noland/Dolan side of the page. We needed to stay away from the constitutional issues in the Noland/Dolan side of the page and stay on the zoning side of the page which was not unlike a setback requirement, like a height requirement and that sort of thing. How this was accomplished was through the Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Committee (AHTAC). This required Metro to develop such an approach and make it an approach that fits into Oregon law and was consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept.

No. C: During the development of that approach, inclusionary housing principles would be used as the basis of a voluntary program for the goals of getting at least 20% of new units as affordable. Mr. Shaw continued his review of 97-715A saying the other goal would be that accessory dwelling units be a significant part of new developments by the end of 1998. He said there was a whole review of accessory dwelling regulations happening now as a result of Council's adoption in 1996 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan requirement not to prohibit them. He noted that no one part of the market had seemed to step up to that area at this time.

He stated that "D" had been rewritten to try to capture the intent since it had not been understood at the first draft. Section "F" had language changes to state all policies of this resolution would go forward in 1998, including a commitment from budget. He said significant movement toward those goals would be necessary in 1998. He finished by saying that Section "G" was a more specific policy to provide a minimum percentage of affordable units and accessory dwellings in the Urban Reserves.

Presiding Officer Kvistad convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:37 p.m.

1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

Art Lewellyn, LOTI (Loop Oriented Transit Intermodal) Designer, spoke to the Council again about supporting the South North Light Rail planning process if not the alignment. He reviewed streetcar alignment that would encircle the Lloyd Center and put an electric bus system on the mall with a frequency benefit that the light rail could not provide. He reviewed his Milwaukie proposal which included using existing bridge structures. He said he would not tunnel under HWY. 224, but would go through the car wash facility because of the commercial and redevelopment possibilities plus it would allow more amenities.

3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS

None.

4. MPAC COMMUNICATION

This item was moved to a later time on the agenda.

5. CONSENT AGENDA

5.1 Consideration meeting minutes of the November 13, 1997 Regular Council Meeting and the October 31, 1997 Council Work Session.

Motion: **Councilor Morissette** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of November 6, 1997 Regular Council Meeting and the October 31, 1997 Council Work Session.

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

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

Presiding Officer Kvistad introduced Mr. Hayes, a local philanthropist who had recently made the first land donation to the Metro Greenspaces Program, 2.1 acres near Whitaker Pond in northeast Portland, and told of the work Mr. Hayes had done with Council over the past several years to preserve the land. This donation put all of the land at the western pond in public ownership. A stormwater treatment facility had been built to keep stormwater pollutants out of the western pond. He thanked everyone involved in the work to get this done.

Councilor Washington presented Mr. Hayes with a picture of the pond on a plaque and thanked him for his contribution of land at Whitaker Pond.

Presiding Officer Kvistad also thanked Mr. Hayes on behalf of the Council and Metro and the Greenspaces program.

4. MPAC COMMUNICATION

Mayor Lou Ogden, City of Tualatin, spoke on behalf of Mayor Drake, the Chair of MPAC regarding the issue of affordable housing. He said he could speak for all of his colleagues when he said it was a serious issue. He related that he had participated in meetings with advocates and builders to gain information for MPAC members on the issues. He was concerned there was not enough discussion to properly make a recommendation in the time allowed. The only recommendation made was to come back to the matter at a later date, and now it had turned up as a specific resolution already formed and without that happening. More specifically about the resolution, he read: "item 2, Metro shall link regional transportation funding to affordable housing policy." He said he did not see the direct link between affordable housing and transportation funding although he knew all the decisions made would affect transportation somehow. He said item #3 best summarized MPAC's recommendation that Metro should play a lead role in providing a forum for the committee to work out the functional plan. He summarized by talking about #6 the framework plan as a requirement on Metro, not on the local governments. He said functional plans were requirements on local governments. He said a framework plan so specific that it said a functional plan had to have certain things would have to be agreed upon by local governments and it would be a grave mistake not to have that agreement before such a resolution was passed. He reiterated that he was not speaking for everyone, but for sure for Councilors Kvistad and McLain's jurisdictions. He said he knew from speaking to people that they would not support this unanimously. He said they were not against affordable housing or inclusionary zoning as a tool necessarily, but they would not be in favor of something that would potentially lead to mandatory inclusionary zoning. He asked the Councilors to consider this when they voted. He felt the most troubling was the rather direct implications of the resolution and the time frame of it. He could not see how a functional plan could be developed and approved and implemented and have the region moving significantly toward that goal by 1998.

He said that while this was somewhat personal for him, it also represented the lack of consensus and recommendation from MPAC to move in this direction. He said their position was to use affordable housing in the Framework Plan as a placeholder to be developed at a later time. He did not see how this resolution did that properly.

Councilor Morissette said Clackamas County would probably agree with that.

Councilor McLain thanked Mayor Ogden for coming. She pointed out that the resolution that was before the Council today included much of the work and suggestion from MPAC, both majority and minority reports. One of the things already talked about was b and c as options.

Most of the information of this resolution was off of that list. Much of the testimony received in two public hearings was incorporated as some of the ideas being discussed in the resolution. It was very important to remind Lou Ogden and themselves that they did hear that there was much more in the way of needed consensus building on the particulars. One of the things Councilor Washington did so well, though there might be an amendment on that particular issue today, was he indicated that he would agree that conversation needed to continue over the next year as far as what would an incentive based or mandatory based inclusionary zoning approach look like in this region. It allowed the rest of the partners to dialogue with the Council as to what those issues and concerns might be. One comment made at MPAC that had stuck with her was if MPAC told the Council anything, it was do something, don't make it another placeholder like in RUGGOs or the Functional Plan. It was time to get serious. She heard that 3-4 times during and after the meeting. The detail was being turned over to an official committee to be formed soon. Both sides agreed the issue of affordable housing was important.

Mayor Ogden said he understood Councilor McLain to say that most of the information in the Resolution was taken from the MPAC recommendation, items B and C. He did not have a problem with those items, or most of the resolution. He pointed out the parts he did have a problem with and said with complete certainty that those items had not been passed on by MPAC. Though a majority of the material was, it was the contentious items that made the difference in the mandatory inclusionary zoning, the 1998 time frame and the requirements on local governments. He pointed out that 2-3 people were not the majority of a 9-8 vote. He urged her to look at what the majority of the committee was saying to the Council.

Councilor McCaig commented that the Council had a presentation from MPAC representatives with majority and minority reports. For the purpose of this discussion, there was nothing new. Mayor Ogden may not agree with it but there was no new information being presented. The only new thing was the majority recommendation of the Council as to where they would go. She said there had been the benefit of debate for months on this issue.

Mayor Ogden said he could not agree with Councilor McCaig more. His personal concern was with regard to MPAC's role. He did not believe that the recommendation coming out of MPAC addressed specifically the issue of mandatory inclusionary zoning, the time frame and the requirements on cities and counties as much as it addressed recognition of the problem and the scope of the debate, and the fact that MPAC strongly recommended not taking a specific direction but to use it as a placeholder for affordable housing. He thought the process would be different for this resolution.

Councilor Morissette said to Mayor Ogden that his comments were well phrased. He also could not believe something as contentious as this was going to be before the Council. He thought this was just a glimmer of the controversy something like this would cause. It all but said there would be inclusionary zoning. He read "F" regionwide mandatory inclusionary zoning and other functional plan requirements based on the zoning approach developed by Metro shall be considered for functional plan implementation at the end of 1998 if these cooperative programs have not significantly moved the region toward the goals of this policy." He said as a builder he did not think he could accomplish a lot of this before the end of the year or 12 months from now. He agreed that the timeline was not correct. He said if something like this moved too quickly it was the beginning of a partnership breakdown. He agreed with the testimony given. Be very cautious.

Councilor Washington thanked Mayor Ogden for his comments. In this process they had made a genuine effort to take MPAC's comments. In working with the various advisory committees and

the public we listened and took advice from all of the partners. He felt the council made a real effort to do the job right.

Mayor Ogden responded that he knew how much effort had been put into the issue. He said MPAC which represented predominately elected and appointed local jurisdictions to work with Council on these issues.

Councilor Washington said he knew they would be working together and took the matter seriously.

Councilor McLain said it was important to say that MPAC gave Council their advice and Council agreed to come back on December 3 to talk about the amendments to the base document. There would be a vote after that meeting. She said she had check in with people in her jurisdiction on these matters.

Mayor Ogden said he was simply reporting back.

Councilor Naito thanked Mayor Ogden for coming and said she thought in the past communication problems have existed. She said maybe the time frame in which he received this information packet could have been done better. She said the whole process was moving very quickly and at times had been frustrating for Council as well because of the lack of information in a timely manner. She said a level of patience on both sides was necessary. She also heard that affordable housing was an issue that should be addressed in the Framework Plan and not moved to the future as a placeholder. She felt the resolution they were working on would provide the basis of amendments for Chapter 1 of the Framework Plan so there was still an opportunity to review the specific amendments to the plan and bring specific areas forward. She felt the work was being done well.

Mayor Ogden said Councilor McLain's points were well taken.

6. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

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

Motion to Amend #1: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A with McLain amendment #3 in Chapter 3 with the following language: 3.5.8 Metro, in cooperation with local governments shall develop a functional plan which establishes the criteria which local governments shall address in determining their "level of service standard". The functional plan shall also establish region-wide goals for the provision of parks and open space in various urban design types identified in the 2040 regional growth concept. The functional plan shall apply to the portion of the region within urban growth boundary and the urban reserves plans are within metro's jurisdiction when urban reserve conceptual plans are approved.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** reviewed that this amendment explains when this particular timing would take place as it relates to those Urban Reserve conceptual plans. There was much discussion about the fact that there needed to be some more dialogue about the level of service. In the original draft there were some need for clarification and discussion concerning the level of service.

Councilor Naito asked for a point of clarification on which McLain amendment was being considered at the time.

Councilor McLain responded that she was discussing McLain amendment #3 and continued that the purpose of this amendment was to allow for more discussion about the level of service. There was much discussion at MPAC, GREENTAC, and the Metro Park staff. This seemed to be the language that gave the most comfortable quality to providing more time to reach that particular level of service standard. Councilor McLain did not think that this was weak language, it was strong support for making sure that Metro showed support for parks and openspace within Metro's Regional Framework Plan and the 2040 Growth Concept.

Councilor Morissette concurred with Councilor McLain that the parks were very important especially with the density that the 2040 Plan spoke to. His problem was another layer overlaying already a process in jurisdictions that maintain and manage their parks. He believed that this was a local issue that collectively they should work together on as opposed to Metro regionally. He would not support this amendment.

Vote to

Amend #1: The vote 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The vote was passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Motion to

Amend #2: **Councilor McCaig** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A dealing with Chapter 3, page 89, of the report under identification and inventory of the regional system. The language in bullet 5 would read, inventory existing park facilities, recreational capacity and analysis of park service needs and consistency with the 2040 Growth Concept.

The purpose of this amendment was to make sure that as Metro does master planning and took inventory of the parks throughout the region that Metro expanded their horizon while doing the inventory to include those areas of consistency with the 2040 Plan, specifically growth capacity and transportation.

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

Presiding Officer Kvistad offered better language, consistent with the 2040 Growth Plan instead of and consistency with the 2040 Growth Concept.

Councilor Naito suggested that the Council move forward on the policy today and any changes could be made when a new draft was presented. She thought that the Council should not worry about wordsmithing the Plan at today's meeting.

Councilor McFarland said that the language presented by Councilor McCaig was correct.

Vote to

Amend #2: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to

Amend #3: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A with McLain amendment #6A for Chapter 5, page 145 add new subsection to Policy 5.2 to read: 5.2.3 ~~While construction of levees and flood walls to mitigate flood hazards have been historically viewed as a legitimate flood mitigation measure, the Portland metropolitan~~

~~region recognizes that flooding is a natural phenomenon which is necessary to maintaining the health of stream and river systems.~~ Avoidance of floodplain development and other non-structure flood mitigation measures shall be favored over levee and dike construction and other structural flood mitigation techniques. The use of dikes and levees should only be used for protection of developed urban areas, and should not be used to reclaim vacant floodplain lands for development.

Councilor McLain asked for guidance from Legal Counsel regarding deleting the first sentence of the amendment.

Mr. Cooper said it could be voted on independently of further amendments in the analysis.

Councilor McLain made the motion and explained that the amendment was intended to acknowledge some areas had already built on floodplains and would possibly need some constructed levees and flood walls. She felt that at this time it would be important not to go further into the 2040 Plan to build more of that type of construction.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Morissette** said he would be concerned about protecting homes as well as cities from flooding.

Councilor McFarland reminded everyone that three quarters of downtown Portland had been filled in and built on floodplains.

Vote to:

Amend #3: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to Suspend the Rules: **Councilor Washington** moved to suspend the rules to bring Resolution No. 97- 2583A before the Council at this meeting.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** said suspension of the rules would mean that anything ultimately adopted would be up for further discussion under chapter 1 and the public would have an opportunity to comment at the next regular meeting.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that adoption of the suspension would mean that if a resolution was adopted by Council it would be immediately adopted and could be amended at that time. A follow-up amendment would place it into the Framework Plan.

Councilor McLain said she would vote in favor because the agenda already had affordable housing and it had to be done today to allow staff to prepare the Regional Framework Plan language.

Presiding Officer Kvistad commented that he would vote against it because he would like it to go to MPAC first.

Councilor Morissette said he would not support that resolution because he felt it moved too quickly. He said he was, however, prepared to engage in the discussion of the solutions for affordable housing.

Councilor Naito said she did not believe the issue could be discussed any further if the suspension was not passed. She added that she had some amendments to the resolution that would not be considered today, therefore it would not be in front of MPAC next week either. She said not suspending the rules would table this issue today.

Presiding Officer Kvistad asked Mr. Cooper if the general discussion policies covered taking up the general issue of the item without having it before council specifically as an item.

Mr. Cooper said formal consideration of the resolution required the rules to be suspended. He said this resolution had no legal affect but was a statement of Council's intent.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said it could be discussed but no decisions based on it could be voted on today if the rules were not suspended.

Vote to Suspend the Rules: The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Resolution No. 97-2583A, For the Purpose of Establishing Affordable Housing Policies for the Regional Framework Plan and Implementing Functional Plan Provisions.

Main Motion: **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt Resolution No. 97-2583A.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Washington** said the resolution had been discussed many times and unless anyone had anything new he would like to go forward with it.

Councilor Morissette commented that affordable housing was an important component to a successful region and the decisions made by the Council and other local elected officials and the citizens in the past had taken the problem from an affordable housing problem to a middle-class housing problem. He believed the decisions carried a responsibility to not burden any one segment of the population with the brunt of this solution but to share the burden. He said the proposals now before Council would ultimately lead to inclusionary zoning which he did not support. He reminded Council that the housing market had moved from one of the most affordable in 1990 to one of the least affordable now since the 2040 plan had been implemented. He felt market solutions and not regulatory solutions would be the answer. He believed regulatory solutions were imbedded in this resolution and offered his thoughts on solving the problem with market solutions. These included simplified approval processes, permit fee reductions, expansion of the UGB, reprioritize infrastructure improvements, density bonuses.

Councilor McFarland said much of what Councilor Morissette said about incentives had virtue but maybe it could be mandatory and palatable at the same time.

Councilor Morissette said he believed "mandatory" was a problem and would be a problem. He said 12 months was not enough time. He felt it would take 3-5 years for the solution to have a positive affect.

Councilor McCaig asked for a point of clarification regarding mandatory: would it be appropriate to jump to the amendment about mandatory piece? And address that?

Presiding Officer Kvistad said he was trying to get general comments out of the way and then move to amendments.

Councilor Naito agreed with Councilor Morissette's suggestion to simplify the approval process. She thought it was incorporated already under the item "Provisions to Remove Procedural Barriers to Current Production of Affordable Housing." She supported it.

Councilor McLain said there was a variety of tools to ensure affordable housing. She said this particular document was considering mandatory zoning after looking at other portion of tool box. She suggested commenting on this issue when Councilor McCaig had presented her amendment.

Councilor Morissette said he knew it was still on general discussion but a lot of the document made sense yet some did not. He felt the goals were unattainable and inclusionary zoning would be the ultimate outcome and he totally disagreed with it.

Motion to

Amend #1: **Councilor McCaig** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2583A at Resolved 7.f to read as follows: f. Regionwide mandatory inclusionary zoning and functional plan requirements based on the zoning approach developed by Metro shall be ~~considered~~ included in functional plan implementation at the end of 1998 if these cooperative programs have not significantly moved the region toward the goals of this policy.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** said adopting this amendment would ensure inclusionary zoning. She said future Councils could determine if significant strides had been made and determine whether or not to go forward. The important issue was that the time to make a decision had come and it was time to let people know how seriously Metro took the issue of affordable housing. She said a balance needed to be struck by offering and encouraging the incentives and at the same time not relying entirely on a voluntary program because if it didn't work we would be further behind for achieving the goals in the timeline we established. She said the Regional Framework Plan was a real accomplishment and would be a cohesive document that ultimately set the direction for the region. She thought the document had good things regarding affordable housing. She said the controversy only spoke to the importance of the issue. She felt the longer the discussion and decision were delayed the more difficult the natural pressure of the events would make it to actually make the decision. She hoped to have a serious discussion about adopting a policy establishing a timeline for the incentives and the voluntary programs. She felt at the end of a specific timeline, the decision was not whether to go forward with inclusionary zoning but if inclusionary zoning was needed.

Councilor McLain asked Mr. Shaw if the "have not significantly moved" wording would give future Councils the opportunity to make that decision.

Mr. Shaw said yes it did. He thought that Councilor McCaig correctly described the situation at this time. He said there was a commitment in the policy to consider mandatory inclusionary zoning based on what had been developed over the year in terms of creating a new zoning approach consistent with the new Oregon law and the 2040 Growth Concept. He said this change

was a commitment to mandatory inclusionary zoning if some measure of significant improvement had not been met. The change would put much more emphasis on whether you were going to put in something measurable for significant improvement. A consideration right now was that it implied there would be some measure but that measure hadn't been developed. He suggested perhaps attaching it to performance measures. This change would put more emphasis on those words.

Councilor Morissette said that he believed that voting on this meant that at some point inclusionary zoning was something this region was going to have. He believed voting aye would be a huge mistake.

Councilor McCaig asked Mr. Shaw that the specific measurement in either case was yet to be developed through a variety of avenues. She said that made it even more important to be clear and measurable in order to assure the voluntary element was working. She said she fundamentally believed that the role of government sometimes was to make decisions and you couldn't always achieve parity. She said significant public policy achievements had never come without controversy. She urged Council to support the amendment.

Vote to: The vote was 2 aye/ 5 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors
Amend #1: McLain, Morissette, Washington, Naito and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Motion to Amend #2: **Councilor McCaig** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2538A at Resolved 7.f to read as follows: f. Regionwide mandatory inclusionary zoning and other functional plan requirements based on the zoning approach developed by Metro shall be considered for functional plan implementation regionwide and included in requirements for urban reserve areas at the end of 1998 if these cooperative programs have not significantly moved the region toward the goals of this policy.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McCaig** said this would amend the same provision, f, and allow for voluntary process of Councilor Washington's resolution to go forward. It singled out the Urban Reserves and would make the Urban Reserve element mandatory and not voluntary.

Councilor Morissette said he would have the same objections to this as the last one.

Councilor McFarland urged approval of this resolution.

Councilor McLain said there was a need to provide the local jurisdictions an opportunity for dialogue on this issue. She felt there was a need for refinement.

Presiding Officer Kvistad commented that he saw a problem with having the affordable component in the urban reserves, it would not be near transit or in the urban part of the community. He felt that having an urban zone approach to affordable housing near transit was a far better idea than mandatory inclusionary zoning.

Councilor McCaig said that had been covered in the other amendment that failed. She thanked councilors who supported her in this and stated she felt the issues of affordable housing would not be solved without substantial and significant guidance from government.

Vote to Amend #2: The vote was 2 aye/ 5 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion failed with Councilors McLain, Morissette, Washington, Naito and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Motion to Amend #3: **Councilor Naito** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2538A add to Resolved 3: Supporting a real estate transfer tax as a funding source for an affordable housing fund at the state, regional or local level when that option becomes available under state law.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** felt there was a grave constitutional takings issue and a claim to be made. She said housing was as critical a need as medical care and society as a whole should undertake such a problem. She felt a real estate transfer tax as a funding source was an important tool that should be considered.

Councilor Morissette said he did not support this.

Councilor McLain said she thought that Councilor Naito was being realistic in trying to give some appropriate tools . She commented that it was important to consider public support to make affordable housing work.

Councilor McCaig asked about the language and said there was nothing now that would prohibit anyone from doing this. She wondered why stronger language to direct or suggest was not included.

Councilor Naito said that was a question for the maker of the motion and that it was a matter of four votes.

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

Motion to Amend #4: **Councilor Naito** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2583A to add to existing policy 1.3 Housing: 1.3.3 Metro shall inventory publicly owned lands, including the "air rights" above public lands, to identify underutilized public lands for possible development of affordable housing. *(add friendly amendment language)* excluding parks and open space.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** said a presentation that some public lands consisting of parking lots adjacent to high transit areas could be appropriate for affordable housing above that property. Most were owned by Tri-Met. It came to mind that government owned lands could also be used for development above parking lots or empty spaces.

Presiding Officer Kvistad said that it did not qualify public lands to exclude green and open spaces.

Councilor Naito indicated she would take this as a friendly amendment, to make it clear on the record that they were talking about land slated for development not any other type of land.

Vote to

Amend #4: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to

Amend #5: **Councilor Naito** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2583A to add to existing policy 1.3 Housing: 1.3.4 Metro shall be a resource to assist ~~nonprofit~~ developers of affordable housing and ~~other nonprofit~~ charitable organizations including the "air rights" above those lands for possible development of affordable housing. *(friendly amendment deleted word nonprofit in line 1 and other in line 2)*

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

Discussion: **Councilor Naito** felt nonprofits should be allowed some kind of technical assistance in this matter.

Councilor Morissette also felt it was a good amendment but would delete the word nonprofit from the resolution.

Vote to

Amend #5: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to

Amend #6: **Councilor Naito** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2583A to add in Resolved 7.a the last sentence is amended to read: ~~an exemption shall be allowed for cities or counties which demonstrate a lack of public facilities capacity. Metro shall~~ adopt an exemption process with the performance standard to allow cities and counties an exemption from this requirement if a demonstrated lack of public facilities prevent implementation of this requirement.

Councilor Naito said this amendment would allow a city to make a demonstration that this requirement of increased density would overload their infrastructure, that they could bring it before Council for consideration.

Councilor Morissette said this was a perfect example of what kind of regulatory reform could be. He believed this resolution was a mistake. The development community needed to be able to create affordable housing.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** said that one of the reasons she supported this amendment was because the exception in the original document said it would be allowed. She felt it was important to make the cities demonstrate through performance standards that there was a reason they should be exempt. Councilor Naito's language would improve that circumstance.

Councilor Morissette said he disagreed.

Councilor Naito said she felt the existing language was very broad and cities and counties could come in and say they couldn't support the density. This would give them performance standards to meet to show they could not.

Vote to

Amend #6: The vote was 4 aye/ 3 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilors McFarland and Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Motion to Amend #7: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2583A on page 4 Resolved #6 the following bullet: ~~provision for seeking regionwide development and approvals in legislation.~~

She felt this bullet should not be highlighted as a bullet in the toolbox but should be explored and developed more by task groups. She wanted the line deleted.

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

Discussion: **Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked why not a regional building permit.

Councilor Morissette responded that there wasn't enough room in this building to do plan checks for this region.

Vote to Amend #7: The vote was 6 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor McCaig voting nay.

Councilor McCaig did a vote explanation. She said this was an item that everybody worked on and it made perfect sense but she was a little tired of the paranoia. She said it was a logical thing to be doing and made sense for Metro to coordinate it. She felt a legitimate tool had been eliminated.

Motion to Amend #8: **Presiding Officer Kvistad** moved to amend Resolution No. 97-2583A on page 6 amend 7.f to read as follows: f. If the Fair Share target performance standard for a jurisdiction as specified in the functional plan is not met after five years, Metro shall conduct a hearing at which the jurisdiction shall show cause why Metro should not take one or more of the following actions: a) Rewrite all or a portion of the jurisdiction's zoning or land use regulations to remove procedural and other barriers to affordable housing; b) Assume development approval authority for the jurisdiction; c) Require the jurisdiction to waive or reduce fees or charges for affordable housing; d) Require the jurisdiction to adopt specific additional measures to encourage and give incentives to affordable housing.

Councilor Morissette said he felt that the local planning needed to be left to local communities.

Seconded: There was no seconder.

Councilor Washington said there was a certain amount of controversy here but there always would be. He said the amendment today would take a step to begin to address the issue of affordable housing in the region for all citizens. He felt it was important to have a lot of people involved in the process. He urged an aye vote on the measure.

Vote on the Main Motion for Resolution No.

97-2583A (B version as amended): The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting nay.

Motion to

Amend #4: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A with McLain amendment #1 on Chapter 1 to read as follows: **1.5 Economic Vitality** The region's

economy is a single dynamic system including the urbanized part of the Portland area and lands beyond the Urban Growth Boundary. The economic welfare of residents throughout the region directly impacts the ability of all citizens in the region to create economic vitality for themselves and their communities.

The region's economic development must include all parts of the region, including areas and neighborhoods which have been experiencing increasing poverty and social needs, even during periods of a booming regional economy. To allow the kinds of social and economic delay in older suburbs and the central city that has occurred in other larger and older metro regions is a threat to our quality of life and the health of the regional economy. All neighborhoods and all people should have access to opportunity and share the benefits, as well as the burdens, of economic and population growth in the region.

Monitor regional and subregional indicators of economic vitality, such as the balance of jobs, compensation and housing affordability.

If Metro's monitoring finds that existing efforts to promote and support economic vitality in all parts of the region are inadequate, Metro shall facilitate collaborative regional approaches which better support economic vitality for all parts of the region.

In cooperation with local governments and community residents, Metro shall promote revitalization of existing city and neighborhood centers that have experienced disinvestment and/or are currently underutilized and/or populated by a disproportionately high percentage of people living at or below 80% of the region's median income.

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

Discussion: None.

Vote to

Amend #4: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously

Motion to: **Councilor McLain** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A with
Amend #5: McLain amendment #2 on Chapter 1 Policies by adding new policy:

1.14 School Siting

1.14.1 School and Local Government Plan and Policy Coordination

Metro shall coordinate plans among local governments, including cities, counties, special districts and school districts for adequate school facilities for already developed and urbanizing areas.

1.14.2 Metro Review of Public Facility Plans to Include Schools

Metro, in its review of city and county comprehensive plans for compliance with the Regional Framework Plan, shall consider school facilities to be "public facilities." School facility plans are required to be developed through the Urban Reserve Plans as specified by Metro Code 3.01.012(e)(11). Additions to the Urban Growth Boundary may only be approved by Metro following completion of conceptual school plans which provide for adequate land for school facilities in addition to other requirements.

1.14.3 Resolution of School Facility Funding in the Region

Metro will use the appropriate means, including, but not limited to, public forums, open houses, symposiums, dialogues with state and local government officials, school district representatives, and the general public in order to identify funding sources necessary to acquire future school sites and commensurate capital construction to accommodate anticipated growth in school populations.

1.14.4 Functional Plan

A school siting and facilities functional plan shall be prepared with the advice of MPAC to implement the policies of this Plan. Chapter 9, Implementation (Section 1.4) lists the issues to be considered in the development of the functional plan.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Morissette** questioned Mr. Cooper regarding the intent of the amendment. He asked if the change would trigger the ability of the local jurisdiction to charge an SDC for school under the limits in state law.

Mr. Cooper said state law was not changed at Metro.

Councilor Naito said what we did here did not change state law in any way.

Councilor Morissette said by changing the terminology could be construed it was not different.

Councilor Naito said the SDC rules were defined in state law.

Councilor McLain asked Mr. Cooper to further explain.

Mr. Cooper said Mr. Fregonese has seen the state law that authorized SDCs for 5 types of facilities prohibiting them for any others. Schools were not on the list.

Councilor Morissette said his concern was having this be a SDC component but as long as it was not he would not have a problem supporting the amendment.

Vote to Amend #5: The vote was 7 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion to Amend #6: **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A with Morissette amendment #2 to amend page 28, Policy 1.3, to add: a) as set forth in existing or future functional plans, each city and county shall independently provide an adequate range of and types of housing for a variety of housing types at a variety of income levels and shall further comply with all functional plan requirements established by Metro in determining the need for expanding the Urban Growth Boundary. b) Metro shall through the adoption of functional plan requirement that before goal 10 exception on an exception of the functional plan requirement affecting housing is pursued by a city or county the affect of the grant of the exception on the need for expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary shall be considered.

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

Discussion: **Councilor Morissette** said it was self explanatory.

Mr. Fregonese, Director of Growth Management, said the second bullet was in the Functional Plan now, that was a policy basis for law already existing. It was a good idea to put something about where else the growth should be accommodated.

Councilor Naito said she believed this document was Metro policy and she would support the second bullet item.

Councilor Morissette said he would like to make it clear that all income levels had a choice in the city in the future and some of the plans do not allow that.

Councilor Naito responded that the issue had not been debated.

Councilor Morissette as maker of the motion split a and b for voting.

Councilor McLain said as far as #1, there was a state requirement to do this and it would be important to not confuse the general requirement of the state with Metro's more specific requirement dealing with the 2040 Growth Concept. She felt it was redundant to state law and confusing with Metro's plan. She questioned why it should be there and felt Metro's goals were more potent. She disagreed with section a.

Councilor Morissette said one of the most challengable parts of 2040 was that there was not a housing choice. He believed it was hypocritical to live one way and legislate another. He said if it was redundant, why not go with it. This spoke amendment to moderately affordable housing.

Vote on the 'a' portion of the amendment:

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

Discussion of the 'b' portion of the amendment: **Councilor McLain** commented that she had a very big concern about this item. How many times had they discussed how to use land inside the UGB. She would feel better with a comment from council regarding the issues of the 2040 and the RUGGOs.

Councilor Naito said she would support b.

Councilor Morissette in closing said that once people realized the ramifications of the choices we would have a lot of problems with the plan. Wording we could agree to was important. He asked Council to please consider supporting the amendment.

Vote on the "b" portion of the amendment.

Vote to Amend #6: portion b: The vote was 5 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilors McCaig and McLain voting nay.

Motion to Amend #7: **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A with Councilor Morissette amendment #3 to amend page 31, Policy 1.9, Urban Growth Boundary to add the following bullet:

Urban reserves have been divided into two tiers. If existing first tier lands cannot accommodate the need, additional land from urban reserves will be added to the first tier lands using the same procedures allowed for first tier land. Cities and counties demonstrating special needs will be permitted to expand into second tier land.

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

Discussion: **Councilor McLain** said she would vote no and had a competing amendment. She felt cities and counties were addressed in Metro code and the language was confusing.

Councilor Morissette said he would separate the two bullet points.

Presiding Officer Kvistad split the two bullets and called for 2 votes on the item.

Councilor Naito asked how the statements tied in with everything else.

Mr. Fregonese said the first item had been divided into 2 tiers and existing code was silent as to what happened when the first tier was used up. He said it was logical to designate more first tier land. He read this to mean additional land would be added using the same procedure.

Councilor Naito clarified that the same process for identifying in the first tier would be used to identify another set of land.

Mr. Fregonese said it was like taking more land from the store room after it was gone from the shelf. It established a policy for what was now silent.

Councilor Morissette said this was not the intent of his motion.

Presiding Officer Kvistad called for discussion.

Councilor McCaig said part of the confusion was tier 1 was a variety of acres on which there was general agreement. If more acres had met the criteria, they would have been included in tier 1 in the first place.

Councilor Morissette withdrew this amendment and the following one. He asked Mr. Cooper to help modify the amendments to show the intent to create a situation where there was habitat areas in second tier land.

Motion: **Councilor Morissette** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-715A. with Councilor Morissette #2 to amend page 31, Policy 1.9, Urban Growth Boundary, to add the following bullet:

Cities and counties demonstrating special needs will be permitted to expand into second tier land.

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

Councilor Morissette withdrew his amendment at this time.

Councilor Naito said there were competing amendments and ideas regarding policies as to what happened after first tier lands were considered to add additional lands.

Councilor Morissette said he would not have a problem working something out with the other Councilors when he came back from vacation.

Councilor McLain said all of the amendments left were from other chapters, Chapter 2, 6, final amendments for 3, 4, 5 and 1. She said that would leave the Management chapter.

Presiding Officer Kvistad called for further amendments.

7. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

Councilor Morissette said the rate review committee would be meeting after this Council meeting.

8. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
111397crfp-26	11/07/97	The Fair Share Allocation Formula Needs To Be Changed; The Impact of Inclusionary Zoning on Fair Share Would Be a Positive One, etc.	TO: Mayor Gussie McRobert FROM: Tasha Harmon, Community Development Network of Multnomah County, 2627 NE Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Rm. 202, Portland, OR 97212	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-27	11/11/97	November 12th MPAC Meeting	TO: Rob Drake, Chair MPAC, MPAC members FROM: Mike	Ordinance No. 97-715

			Houck, Audubon Society of Portland, 5151 NW Cornell Rd., Portland, OR 97210 (503)292-6855	
111397crfp-28	11/10/97	Regional Framework Plan/2040 Growth Concept	TO: Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer, Metro Council FROM: Andrew Eisman, Chair, Buckman Community Assoc., 516 SE Morrison, Ste. 217, Portland, Or 97214 (503)235-7082	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-29	11/07/97	Fewer households with children over the next 20 years, etc.	TO: The Editor FROM: David C. Knowles, Dir., City of Portland, Bureau of Planning, and John Fregonese, Dir., Metro, Growth Management	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-30	No date	Creating Livable Streets - Street Design Guidelines for 2040	Prepared for: Metro FROM: Fehr & Peers Assoc., Inc. Transportaton Consultants	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-31	No date	Regional Framework Plan: Environmental Education	TO: Metro Council FROM: David A. Pagni, Teacher on Special Assignment, Dist. Community Partnerships Coordinator, West Linn-Wilsonville School Dist. 3JT, PO Box 35, West Linn, OR 97068	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-32	No date	"The free society that does not take care of	TO: Metro Council FROM:	Ordinance No. 97-715

		its many who are poor will not be able to save its few who are rich.”	Cynthia Winter, 2934 NE 20th, Portland, OR 97212 (503)287-8632	
111397crfp-33	No date	Map - 2020: N/S: LRT/LLR	FROM: Buckman Community Assoc., 516 SE Morrison St. Ste. 217, Portland, OR 97214	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-34	11/03/97	“Consider the comments of Southeast Uplift, etc....”	TO: Metro Council FROM: Charlie Burt, President of the Board of Directors, Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Prog., 3534 SE Main St., Portland, OR 97214 - 232-0010	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-35	Fall 1997	Major issue is affordable housing, and there should be a standing committee and staff at Metro	TO: Metro Council FROM: Tom Johnson, 4905 SE 49th Ave., Portland, OR 97206-4151	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-36	Fall 1997	Issue that there is no mention of commuter rail in the transportation section of the draft 2040 Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Steve Satterlee (he says he is already on the mailing list - did not add address)	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-37	Fall 1997	Improve the Street connectivity stds.; adopt specific street design stds.; look at alternatives to the very expensive “Light Rail”	TO: Metro Council FROM: Paul Lorey, 816 SE 29th, Apt. 306, Portland, OR 97214	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-38	Fall 1997	5.2 Flood Hazard Mitigation Measures, several approaches are suggested...	TO: Metro Council FROM: Raymond Hites, 8827 SE Holgate Blvd., Portland, OR 97266	Ordinance No. 97-715

111397crfp-39	Fall 1997	...pleasantly surprised as to the moral underpinnings that are supporting the 2040	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jerome Cure, 7616 SE Morrison St., Portland, OR 97215	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-40	11/13/97	Resolution from Northwest Oregon Labor Council to the Metro Council	TO: Metro Council FROM: Northwest Oregon Labor Council	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-40	No date	Regional Framework Plan, Chapter 5: Natural Hazards - Summary of changes - Synopsis	TO: Metro Council	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-41	Fall 1997	Our Children - Our Destiny (pamphlet), Vol. 6, No. 2	TO: Metro Council FROM: Urban League of Portland, 10 North Russell St., Portland, OR 97227 (503)280-2600	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-42	10/23/97	Chapter 3 (Parks, Natural Areas, Open Spaces, & Recreational Facilities) of the Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-43	11/13/97	Regional Framework Plan	TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Michael Morrissey	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-44	11/07/97	Regional Framework Plan Schedule	TO: Metro Councilors FROM: Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-45	11/13/97	...lack of affordable housing in the Metro region...	TO: Metro FROM: Abby Kennedy, 1226 NE 73rd, Portland, OR 97213 - 254-1137	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-46	3/6/97	Ordinance No. 96-655E, For the Purpose of Designating Urban Reserve Areas for the	To: Metro FROM: Mike Burton, Executive Officer	Ordinance No. 97-715

111397crfp-47	11/13/97	Portland Metropolitan Area Urban Growth Boundary; Amending Ruggo Ordinance No. 95-625A and Metro Code Chapter 3.01; and Declaring an Emergency MPAC recommendations for Regional Framework Plan	TO: Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer and Metro Councilors FROM: Mark Turpel, Program Supervisor	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-48	11/13/97	Affordable housing in the Framework Plan	TO: The Metro Council FROM: The League of Women Voters of the Columbia River Region, Leeanne MacColl, Pres., 2620 SW Georgian Place, Portland, OR 97201 Phone: 223-7664	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-49	11/07/97	Ordinance No. 97-715	TO: Jon Kvistad, Presiding Office, Metro Council FROM: Mike McKeever, Pres., McKeever/Morris, Inc. 209 SW Oak Street, Ste. 200, Portland, OR 97204	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-50	11/10/97	Memo from Mayor McRobert	TO: Metro Councilors FROM: Tasha Harmon, Coalition for a Livable Future	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-51	11/09/97	Public Hearing On the Framework Plan, Thursday, November 13th, 3pm.	TO: Clerk of the Metro Council FROM: Amy Miller, 2542 NE 11th Ave., Portland, OR 97212	Ordinance No. 97-715

111397crfp-52	11/13/97	Teufel Property in Cedar Mill, Washington County, Testimony Regarding Metro Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Councilors FROM: Gregory S. Hathaway, Davis Wright Tremaine, Ste. 2300, 1300 SW Fifth Ave., Portland, OR 97201-5682	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-53	11/13/97	Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Wendie L. Kellington, Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, PacWest Center, Stes., 1600-1800, 1211 SW Fifth Ave., Portland, OR 97204-3795	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-54	11/13/97	Metro Hearing - November 13 '97	TO: Metro Council FROM: Harry Bruton, 1515 SW 12th Ave., #605, Portland, OR 97201	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-55	No date	Affordable housing for young people	TO: Metro Council FROM: Edwin and Grace Weinstein, 7352 SW 26th Ave., Portland, OR 97219	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-56	11/13/97	Affordable housing for low-income county residents	TO: Presiding Officer Kvistad and Members of the Metro Council FROM: Liora Berry, Rep. of the Housing Advocacy Group, 1001 SW Baseline St., Hillsboro, OR 97123 phone: (503)693-3267, fax (503) 648-	Ordinance No. 97-715

111397crfp-57	11/13/97	Required Inclusionary Zoning, Metro Council, Testimony, November 13, 1997	4175 TO: Metro Council FROM: Gretchen Miller Kafoury, Comm. 1220 SW 5th Ave., Portland, OR 97204 Telephone: (503)823-4151 Fax: (503) 823-3036	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-58	11/13/97	Inclusion of Language on Economic Vitality and Housing in the Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Tanya Collier, Multnomah County Comm., Dist. 3, 1120 SW Fifth St., Ste. 1500, Portland, OR 97204 (503) 248-5217	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-59	11/13/97	Issues Associated with the Imposition of Inclusionary Zoning in the Portland Metropolitan Area	TO: Metro Council FROM: Jerald W. Johnson, Hobson Johnson & Assoc., 610 SW Alder, Ste. 910, Portland, OR 97205-3686	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-60	11/13/97	Metro Council meeting notice for 2 p.m. Thurs., 11/13/97 (newspaper clipping)	TO: Metro Council FROM: The Oregonian	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-61	11/13/97	Regional Framework Plan - Provision on Tier 1 Urban Reserves and Urban Resere Plans	TO: Mr. Dan Cooper FROM: Timothy J. Sercombe, Preston Gates & Ellis, 111 SW Fifth Ave., Ste. 3200, Portland, OR 97204-3688	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-62	11/18/97	Regional Framework Plan Amendment Process	TO: Metro Councilors FROM: Daniel B. Cooper, General Counsel	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-63	11/19/97	Support for the resolutions presented	TO: Metro Council FROM:	Ordinance no. 97-715

		by Councilor Washington for affordable housing	Peg Malloy, Executive Dir., Portland Housing Center (Fax)	
111397crfp-64	11/18/97	Councilor Don Morissette Amendments No. 1, 2, 3, & 4	TO: Metro Council FROM: Don Morissette	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-65	11/18/97	Councilor McLain Amendments No. 1-7	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-66	11/18/97	Affordable Housing Resolution	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor Washington	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-67	11/19/97	Summaries of Proposed Amendments to Regional Framework Plan Revision II, Councilor McLain Amendment No. 1, Add Economic Vitality Policy to replace Urban Vitality section 1.5	TO: Metro Council FROM: Meg Bushman, MPAC and Coalition for Livable Future, ext. 1918	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-68	11/19/97	Councilor Naito Amendment No. 1	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor Naito	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-69		Ordinance No. 97-715A	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-70	11/18/97	Metro Resolution No. 97-2538	TO: MPAC Members and Alternates FROM: Gussie McRobert, Mayor, City of Gresham, 1333NW Eastman Parkway, Gresham, OR 97030-3813	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-71	11/13/97	Proposed Council Ordinance No. 97-715, the Regional Framework Plan (RFP)	TO: Councilor Jon Kvistad, Presiding Officer FROM: Mark Whitlow, Bogle	Ordinance No. 97-715

111397crfp-72	11/13/97	Regional Framework Plan and Affordable Housing	& Gates, 1400 KOIN Center, 222 SW Columbia, Portland, OR 97201-6793 (503)2221515	TO: Metro Council FROM: Kate Bowie, Neighborhood House, Inc., 7780 SW Capitol Hwy., Portland, OR 97219 (503)246-1663	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-73	11/13/97	Metro meeting schedules (Regional Facilities, Govt. Affairs, etc. - newspaper clipping)		TO: Metro FROM: The Oregonian	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-74	11/17/97	Testimony from the hearing of 11/13		TO: Metro Councilors FROM: Alan Hipolito, Dir. of Env't'l Programs, The Urban League of Portland, 10 N. Russell St., Portland, OR 97227-1619 (503)280-2600	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-75	11/17/97	Revised Funding and Fiscal Element Language for the Implementation Chapter (Chapter 9) of the Regional Framework Plan		TO: Metro Councilors FROM: James A. Zehren, Stoel Rives, 900 SW Fifth Ave., Ste. 2300, Portland, OR 97204-1268 (503)224-3380	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-76	11/18/97	Support of the housing advocates' proposal for mandatory and measurable standards for affordable housing on a region-wide basis		TO: Metro Councilors FROM: Rebecca Childs, 2025 SE Caruthers #3, Portland, OR 97214	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-77	11/17/97	Comments on the "Issues Associated		TO: Jon Kvistad FROM: Will	Ordinance No. 97-715

		with the Imposition of Inclusionary Zoning on the Portland Metropolitan Area”	White, Executive Dir., Housing Development Center, 2627 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Portland, OR 97212 (503)335-3668	
111397crfp-78	11/14/97	Ordinance 97-715A	TO: Presiding Officer Kvistad and Metro Councilors FROM: Mike McKeever, Pres., McKeever/Morris, Inc., 209 SW Oak St., Portland, OR 97204	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-79	November 1997	Regional Framework Plan - Introduction: Foundations of the Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-80	11/13/97	Regional Framework Plan postcard	TO: Metro Council FROM: Chris Billington, Clerk of the Council	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-81	11/13/97	Testimony Before Metro Council, Thursday, November 13, 1997 - HAZTAC - Revisions to Chapter 5, Natural Hazards of the Framework Plan - Edward H. Trompke and Scott Porter, Presenters	TO: Metro Council FROM: Edward H. Trompke and Scott Porter, Presenters	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-82	11/13/97	Written Testimony in Support of Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Sue Marshall, 15941 SW Inverurie Rd., Lake Oswego, OR 97035	Ordinance No. 97-715
111397crfp-83	11/11/97	Metro Water Quality and Flood Area Management Model Ordinance	TO: Ms. Susan McLain FROM: Neil Rambo, Extension Agent, Extension	

112097crfp-01	11/18/97	Regional Framework Plan - Councilor McLain Amendment No. 1	Service, Oregon State University, 186 TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-02	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan - Councilor McLain Amendment No. 6A - Proposed language	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-03	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan - Councilor McLain Amendment No. 3 (pg. 101 amend Sec. 3.5.8)	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-04	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan - Councilor McLain Amendment No. 6A - Adopted language - Passed	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McLain	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-05	11/20/97	Kvistad Amendment No. 2 to Resolution 97-2583-A	TO: Metro Council FROM: Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-06	11/20/97	Kvistad Amendment No. 1 to Resolution 97-2583	TO: Metro Council FROM: Presiding Officer Jon Kvistad	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-07	11/20/97	Councilor McCaig Amendment No. 3 (Res. No. 2583A on affordable housing policies - amended at Resolved 7.f - ...Metro shall be included...functional plan...)	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McCaig	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-08	11/20/97	Councilor McCaig Amendment No. 4 (Res. No. 2583A amended at Resolved 7.f ...regionwide and included in requirements for urban reserve, etc....)	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McCaig	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-09	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan - Counselor Sponsored Amendments as of	TO: Metro Council FROM: McLain, Morissette,	Ordinance No. 97-715

		November 20, 1997	Naito, Washington	
112097crfp-10	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan - Councilor McCaig Amendment No. 5	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McCaig	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-11	11/20/97	Building a More Affordable Future (For Immediate Release)	TO: Metro FROM: Beth Anne Steele	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-12	11/18/97	Recommended amendments to Chapter 3 (Parks, Open Spaces, Natural Areas, Recreational Facilities)	TO: Councilor Susan McLain FROM: Charles Ciecko, Dir., Regional Parks and Greenspaces	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-13	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan -Counselor Sponsored Amendments - Council Action	TO: Metro FROM: McCaig, McLain, Morissette, Naito, Washington	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-14	11/20/97	Resolution No. 97-2583B	TO: Metro Introduced by Councilor Washington	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-15	11/18/97	Resolution No. 97-2538	TO: Metro Growth Management Committee FROM: Mayor Gussie McRobert	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-16	11/20/97	Regional Framework Plan	TO: Metro Council FROM: Meeky Blizzard, Executive Dir., Sensible Transportation Options for People, 15405 SW 116th Ave., #202B, Tigard, OR 97224-2600 (503)624-6083	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-17	11/17/97	Cooper Mountain Area	TO: Councilor McLain FROM: Kim A Vandehey	Ordinance No. 97-715
112097crfp-18	11/14/97	Affordable housing	TO: Councilor Washington FROM: Cynthia Winter,	Ordinance No. 97-715

112097crfp-19

11/19/97

Regional Framework
Plan, Discussion Draft
- May 1997 - Ch. 3
Parks, Open Spaces
and Recreational
Facilities

Executive Dir.,
Habitat for
Humanity
(503)284-5469
TO: Council
FROM: Kirky
Doblie, Chair,
Parks and
Community
Centers
Committee,
Southwest
Neighborhoods,
Inc., 7688 SW
Capitol Highway,
Portland, OR
97219 (503)823-
4592

Ordinance No. 97-715