



**METRO**

**Agenda**

MEETING: METRO COUNCIL WORK SESSION  
DATE: December 01, 2009  
DAY: Tuesday  
TIME: 1:00 p.m.  
PLACE: Metro Council Chamber

**CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

- |                |           |   |                 |
|----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| <b>1:00 PM</b> | <b>1.</b> | <b>DISCUSSION OF AGENDA FOR COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING, DECEMBER 3, 2009/ADMINISTRATIVE/CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS</b> |                 |
| <b>1:15 PM</b> | <b>2.</b> | <b>REGIONAL PARKS SYSTEM UPDATE</b>   | Wetter/Staff    |
| <b>1:45 PM</b> | <b>3.</b> | <b>URBAN GROWTH REPORT DISCUSSION</b>   | Wilkinson/Staff |
| <b>2:15 PM</b> | <b>4.</b> | <b>BREAK</b>  |                 |
| <b>2:20 PM</b> | <b>5.</b> | <b>CONGESTION PRICING PILOT PRESENTATION</b>  | Jeff Buxbaum    |
| <b>3:05 PM</b> | <b>6.</b> | <b>COUNCIL BRIEFINGS/COMMUNICATION</b>  |                 |

**ADJOURN**

Agenda Item Number 2.0

**REGIONAL PARKS SYSTEM  
UPDATE**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, December 1, 2009  
Metro Council Chamber

Agenda Item Number 3.0

**URBAN GROWTH REPORT DISCUSSION**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, December 1, 2009  
Metro Council Chamber



Date: November 25, 2009  
To: Metro Council  
From: Malu Wilkinson, UGR Project Manager  
Re: UGR discussion at 12/1/2009 Council Work Session

---

On December 10, 2009 the Metro Council is scheduled to consider Resolution #09-4094 that would accept the 20 and 50 year population and employment forecasts and the Urban Growth Report as the basis of growth management decisions to be made in 2010. The draft forecasts and UGR were released on September 15, 2009 as part of the COO Recommendation on Making the Greatest Place: Strategies for a sustainable and prosperous region. Staff has received a number of comments on the draft reports this fall. MPAC has spent considerable time discussing the forecasts and UGR, recommending unanimously that the Metro Council accept the resolution with a few amendments.

I have attached two documents for review at your work session on 12/1/09:

1. A revised version of the resolution that incorporates MPAC's recommended changes
2. A description of the technical revisions recommended by staff based on comments received on the draft UGR

Please bring your copy of the draft UGR to the 12/1/09 work session to facilitate a productive review of the recommended changes.

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCEPTING THE  
POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT  
FORECASTS AND THE URBAN GROWTH  
REPORT AS SUPPORT FOR DETERMINATION  
OF CAPACITY OF THE URBAN GROWTH  
BOUNDARY

) RESOLUTION NO. 09-~~XXXX~~4094

) Introduced by Chief Operating Officer  
Michael Jordan with the Concurrence of  
Council President David Bragdon

WHEREAS, state law requires Metro to determine the capacity of the urban growth boundary (UGB) to accommodate the next 20 years' worth of population and employment growth by the end of December, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro published range forecasts of population and employment growth to the years 2030 and 2060 on March 19, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro published a preliminary analysis of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate the range of new dwelling units relating to the range of forecast population growth on March 31, 2009; and

WHEREAS, state law requires Metro to provide capacity to encourage the availability of dwelling units at price ranges and rent levels commensurate with the financial capabilities of households expected over the planning period; and

WHEREAS, Metro published a preliminary Housing Needs Analysis on April 22, 2009, that showed the effects on housing affordability of forecast growth under existing policies and investment levels; and

WHEREAS, Metro published a preliminary analysis of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate the range of new employment relating to the range of forecast employment growth on May 6, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the region has an interest in an adequate supply of land appropriate for industries that prefer larger parcels near transportation facilities and an interest in efficient use of existing transportation facilities; and

WHEREAS, Metro sought and received comments on the preliminary analyses of housing and employment capacity from its Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and its Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), local governments in the region, public, private and non-profit organizations and citizens;

WHEREAS, Metro considered the comments and published revised draft analyses of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate growth to year 2030 on September 15, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro sought and received comments on the revised draft analyses from MPAC and JPACT; local governments in the region; and public, private and non-profit organizations and citizens; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council held open houses and public hearings on the revised draft analyses on September 21, 22 and 24 and October 1, 8 and 15, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Metro considered comments received and made revisions to the final draft analyses of the capacity of the existing UGB to accommodate the range of new dwelling units and employment relating to the range of forecast population and employment growth; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council

1. The Council accepts the “20 and 50 year Regional population and employment forecasts” ~~dated December —, 2009, attached and~~ incorporated into the “Draft Urban Growth Report 2009-2030”, dated September 15, 2009, as revised by this resolution ~~as Exhibit A,~~ as a basis for analysis of need for capacity in the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 and for actions the Council will take to add capacity by ordinance in 2010, pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goal 14, and directs the staff to work with MPAC to identify site opportunities for industries that prefer large parcels, with a priority to brownfields and assembly of smaller parcels inside the UGB.
2. The Council accepts the “Draft Urban Growth Report 2009-2030”, dated ~~December —September 15,~~ 2009, with its analysis of housing needs, attached and incorporated into this resolution as Exhibit ~~BA,~~ with the revisions described in the Staff Report dated December 3, 2009, attached as Exhibit B, as a basis for analysis of need for capacity in the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 and for actions the Council will take to add housing and employment capacity by ordinance in 2010, pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goals 14 and 10.
3. Acceptance of Exhibits ~~A and B~~ by the Council meets Metro’s responsibility under state law to analyze the capacity of the UGB to accommodate growth to the year 2030 as a preliminary step toward providing sufficient capacity to accommodate that growth. The Council will make a final land use decision to respond to this capacity analysis in 2010.
4. The Council directs the Chief Operating Officer to submit Exhibits ~~A and B,~~ together with such actions the Council adopts by ordinance to add any needed capacity pursuant to ORS 197.296(6) and statewide planning Goal 14, to the Land Conservation and Development Commission as part of periodic review pursuant to ORS 197.626, following adoption of the capacity ordinance in 2010.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 17th day of December, 2009

---

David Bragdon, Council President

Approved as to form:

---

Daniel B. Cooper, Metro Attorney

## ATTACHMENT 2

# Proposed revisions and corrections to September 15, 2009 Draft Urban Growth Report

Additions to text are shown underlined

Deletions are shown ~~striketrough~~

## Employment analysis

### Pg. 35:

Delete the final paragraph on the page.

### Appendix 3, page 1:

Delete the final paragraph on the page.

### Pg. 54, Table 20:

Edit the caption to read as follows:

“Table 20: ~~Net~~ New employment, square feet and acreage demand, net of refill, by market ring under two growth scenarios (2010 to 2030)”

### Pg. 55:

Text to be revised as follows:

“Capacity demand varies by market subarea, accounting for market realities in the location decisions made by the region’s employers. Based on analysis of the trends just described, net of refill demand, there will be ~~a need demand~~ for between 274 and 4,930 acres of ~~additional~~ industrial capacity and between 1,944 and 3,832 acres of ~~additional~~ non-industrial capacity within the UGB by 2030.”

“Figures 14-17 show the 20-year capacity demand (net of refill ~~redevelopment~~ demand) by market subarea. At the low end of the population and employment forecast there is a projected flat demand for industrial jobs, commensurate with national trends showing a decline in manufacturing.”

### Pgs. 56-57, Figures 14-17:

Edit captions to clarify that demand is net of refill demand

### Pg. 58:

Edit the first paragraph on the page as follows:

“New industrial opportunities that require large buildable lots are difficult to forecast accurately. Demand for large industrial lots (greater than 25 gross acres) is usually precipitated by one or more large employers looking for a new location for a production or warehouse facility. This is dependent on the decisions of individual firms and not the trends of an industry as a whole. Consequently, forecasts of large lot demand are inevitably uncertain. With that caveat, this analysis looks at the large lot preferences of large employers and multi-tenant business parks using a forecast-based approach. Given this uncertainty, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee has recommended the consideration of additional large lot need that supplements the need identified through the employment forecast-based approach.”



Edit the final paragraph on the page as follows:

“Large-lot demand for marine and rail terminal uses is not included in this analysis. These types of facilities may have relatively few employees and little building square footage. Consequently, a job forecast may be an inadequate means of forecasting land demand for these uses. This is another reason why additional large lot need is considered as a supplement to the need identified through the employment forecast-based approach.” ~~Furthermore~~–However, these uses are extremely location specific and their needs are not likely to be met ~~accommodated~~ through UGB expansions.

**Pg. 83:**

Last paragraph on page to be revised as follows:

“Figures 30 and 31 depict the 5- and 20-year ~~acreage building square foot~~ demand range (from the 20-year forecast) for industrial and ~~commercial non-industrial employment~~ along with the previously described capacity range. Large lot demand and capacity are addressed separately. The demand range is illustrated with two lines that show the upper and lower end of the ~~acreage building square foot~~ demand forecast.”

**Pg. 84:**

Insert the following text below figure 30:

“This portion of the analysis assesses the current urban growth boundary’s capacity to accommodate industrial job growth on vacant, buildable land or through refill. The assessment of demand for large, vacant lots for industrial uses is handled separately. At both ends of the employment range forecast, there is adequate capacity inside the current urban growth boundary to accommodate the next 20 years of general industrial job growth.”

**Pg. 85:**

Insert the following text below figure 31:

“Depending on the amount of non-industrial employment growth that is realized, there is a need for zero to 1,168 acres of additional capacity.”

**Pg. 86:**

To reflect MPAC’s recommendation on large lots for industrial uses, edit the heading at the top of the page to read as follows:

“Comparison of large lot supply with forecast-based assessment of ~~potential~~ large lot demand”

To reflect MPAC’s recommendation, edit the second paragraph on the page to read as follows:

“Without any assumption about tax lot assembly, this employment forecast-based analysis identifies surplus capacity of 25-to-50-acre lots, but a potential deficit of tax lots over 50 acres and lots over 100 acres (under both the high and low growth forecasts), as shown in Table 32.”

To reflect MPAC’s recommendation, add the following section to the end of the page:

### **“Policy basis for considering an expanded range of large lot demand**

The forecast-based assessment of large lot demand provides policy makers with an initial range of potential demand to consider. However, as noted, assessing future large lot demand with a job forecast-based approach has limitations. There are legitimate policy reasons to consider a wider range of demand for large lots, using the initial forecast-based approach for a sense of scale. Doing so gives policy makers the flexibility to weigh the risks and benefits of providing too much or too little large lot capacity.

There is inherent uncertainty in forecasting employment in large, traded-sector firms, which may consider several cities, regions, states or countries when choosing a site. These firms can have economic multiplier effects, bringing wealth into the region and leading to spinoff firms and employment. A few cities in the region have identified large lot users (particularly high-tech manufacturers) as a primary focus of their economic development plans. The range of large lots that will be needed over the next 20 years will be the product of a number of factors that are impossible to forecast, including:

- Decisions of individual firms that participate in a global marketplace; and
- The political will of cities, the region, and the State (both here and in other regions) to implement economic development strategies.

The forecast-based analysis also assumes that preferences for large lots will remain largely the same in the future as they are today. There are at least two countervailing trends that indicate preferences may change, particularly for industrial, warehouse, and distribution uses. The direction and degree of change is open to interpretation:

- Rising land prices may lead to more efficient use of land, thereby increasing the number of employees per acre; and
- The substitution of machinery and robotics for human labor may reduce the number of employees per acre.

An employment forecast-based approach may also have shortcomings for estimating land needs for rail, air and marine terminal uses. These uses are critical to the health of the region’s economy. Freight terminal uses can require relatively large areas of land, but do not necessarily require high employment densities. Consequently, their needs may not be adequately accounted for using an employment forecast alone.

No amount of technical analysis can provide a completely precise assessment of future large lot demand. Thus, the Metro Policy Advisory Committee has expressed a desire to have flexibility in the region’s plans to attract and retain potential traded-sector employment growth. Due to the limitations of further technical analysis, the expansion of the potential range of large lot need is being done on a policy basis rather than through technical analysis. This expansion of the range is consistent with the guidance offered by Oregon Administrative Rule 660-024-0040, which states that: “the 20-year need determinations are estimates which, although based on the best available information and methodologies, should not be held to an unreasonably high level of precision.”

When the forecast-based analysis and policy considerations are taken into account, as recommended by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee, the total 20-year need for additional capacity in large lot configurations is between 200 and 1,500 acres. Within this range, there is a need for policy flexibility in determining the sizes and locations of large lots to provide, so this final analysis does not specify those characteristics.”

## **Residential analysis**

**Pg. 114:**

Insert a map of the residential buildable land inventory.

**Pages 115-117**

Edit the section on parks as follows:

**“Parks:** To calculate the UGB’s capacity for residential growth, this urban growth report deducts the amount of vacant land inside the UGB that may be used for future parks (effectively, this amount of land is not available for residential development). This calculation only includes future parks that are intended for active uses, such as ball fields or playgrounds. Habitat or natural areas are not included since they are already deducted from the vacant land inventory.

There are several possible ways to calculate the number of acres that may be used for future parks. ~~One approach would be to use a level of service standard for parks. However, an agreed upon regional standard does not exist. Since no alternative approach has been suggested,~~ This urban growth report builds on ~~uses the same methodology that was used for the 2002 report. That~~ This methodology was recommended by MPAC in 2002 and was based on estimated park land acquisition revenues, based on from system development charges (SDCs).

To inform the analysis in this report, current park SDC rates were inventoried for each city in the region. (Information may be found in Appendix 6.) Most of the local governments that levied parks SDCs in 2002 have increased their rates. In addition, two cities, King City and Rivergrove, have started levying parks SDCs since 2002. Also, a few local governments are currently employing a system whereby different fees are levied in different locations.

The 2002 urban growth report estimated that 1,100 acres of vacant land inside the UGB would be used for future parks. Like other possible approaches to estimating future park acreage inside the UGB, this SDC approach has its limitations and should be taken as a reasonable estimate rather than a precise accounting. Due to these limitations (summarized below), the updated inventory of park SDC rates does not provide a compelling reason to substantially alter ~~change~~ this assumption:

- Each city will respond to residential growth in different ways. For instance, some cities may not have much vacant land left for parks, but will use SDC revenues to make capital improvements to existing parks.
- Different cities will witness different amounts of residential growth. A local government with high parks SDCs may not see a lot of growth over the next 20 years, while a local government with low SDC rates may see tremendous growth, or vice versa.
- While a majority of local governments around the region have increased their parks SDCs over the last several years, this does not mean that there is additional money for land acquisition.
  - It is likely that the increased rates are an attempt to more fully recuperate land acquisition or capital improvement costs and that updated SDC rates still do not cover all costs.
  - The cost of flat, vacant land will continue to increase. SDC revenues will not necessarily keep pace with land values.
- Funding for parks is and probably will continue to be limited. Metro’s 2008 *Regional Infrastructure Analysis* found that the cost and availability of land is one of the biggest challenges in providing sufficient parks to accommodate future growth.

- A line item in an urban growth report for parks will not necessarily result in parks for citizens to enjoy. The effect is simply that the vacant land supply assumption is reduced, increasing the potential need for UGB expansions. A UGB expansion will not address park needs in existing urban areas, which are likely to see substantial growth.
  - There is a Major UGB Amendment process that can be initiated by local jurisdictions to bring land into the UGB for park needs that are not anticipated in cyclical legislative UGB expansions (as contemplated in the context of this report). The Major Amendment Process may be a more appropriate means of addressing specific park needs that can be accommodated through UGB expansions.

Limited funding and limited vacant land in urban locations point to a need for creative and collaborative solutions that help ensure the future provision of parks throughout the region:

- Efficient use of existing land and infrastructure by taking advantage of power line easements or the space around reservoirs and water towers. For example, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District utilizes existing Bonneville Power Administration rights of way to operate parks and trails.
- Collaboration between multiple districts or other local governments. Sunnyside Village Green Park is a collaborative effort between North Clackamas Parks and Recreation District and Clackamas County's Water Environment Services Department that combines park facilities with stormwater management infrastructure.
- The Trust for Public Land's 2009 article on "shoehorn parks" recognizes that school facilities can be leveraged to create park capacity, but doing so requires great collaboration and commitment to success from park districts and the school system (Harnik, 2009). Popular events like Portland's Sunday Parkways demonstrate that streets can serve as temporary park space.

To maintain an approach that is consistent with the one recommended by MPAC in 2002, an implied parks level of service was calculated as follows:

The 2002 Urban Growth Report forecasted growth of 220,700 dwelling units over the 20 year period and identified a 1,100 acre deduction for future parks for the same time period. The implied level of service was 1,100 park acres for 220,700 new dwelling units. The current Urban Growth Report forecasts 262,400 new dwelling units in the UGB over the next 20 years (baseline assumption). Applying the same level of service standard ( $1,100 / 220,700 * 262,400$ ) results in a deduction of 1,300 acres for new parks."

#### **Appendix 6, page 11**

Edit the final paragraph on the page to read as follows:

"The 2002 urban growth report estimated that 1,100 acres of vacant land inside the UGB would be used for future parks. Like other possible approaches to estimating future park acreage inside the UGB, this SDC approach has its limitations and should be taken as a reasonable estimate rather than a precise accounting. Due to these limitations (summarized below), the updated inventory of park SDC rates does not provide a compelling reason to substantially alter ~~change~~ this assumption:"

Add the following text:

“To maintain an approach that is consistent with the one recommended by MPAC in 2002, an implied parks level of service was calculated as follows:

The 2002 Urban Growth Report forecasted growth of 220,700 dwelling units over the 20 year period and identified a 1,100 acre deduction for future parks over the same time period. The implied level of service was 1,100 park acres for 220,700 new dwelling units. The current Urban Growth Report forecasts 262,400 new dwelling units in the UGB over the next 20 years (baseline assumption). Applying the same level of service standard ( $1,100 / 220,700 * 262,400$ ) results in a deduction of 1,300 acres for new parks.”

**Pg. 127:**

Correct the residential supply range on the bottom of the page such that the expected supply is 196,900 dwelling units and the potential supply is 356,800 dwelling units. This correction is necessary because of the revised estimate of future parks acreage and to correct calculation errors.

## Appendix 6, page 2:

Replace the table with the following. This correction is necessary because of the revised future parks acreage estimate and to correct calculation errors.

2009 to 2030 PRELIMINARY Urban Growth Report (UGR)				
DRAFT Residential Dwelling Capacity Range Assessment				
March 2009				
Line No.		Residential DEMAND Assumption		
		Low	Baseline	High
Residential Demand Estimates (in Dwelling Units)				
1a/	7-County Population Forecast (2007 to 2030)	728,200	875,000	1,024,400
1b/	7-County Household Forecast (2007 to 2030)	348,600	408,300	469,100
2/	Capture 61.8% of 7-County Forecast in Metro UGB	215,400	252,300	289,900
3/	plus: 4% vacancy rate (source: 2000 Census)	8,600	10,100	11,600
4/	Dwelling Unit Demand in the Metro UGB:	224,000	262,400	301,500
		Residential SUPPLY Assumptions		
July 2007 Vacant Land Inventory (Metro UGB):		BASELINE		
5/	Gross Vacant Land in current Metro UGB		44,800	
6/	less: Local Water Quality, floodways and Habitat Protection areas (ENV)		8,600	
7/	Gross Vacant Buildable Acres in Metro UGB (GVBA)		36,200	
8/	less: Fed., State, Municipal exempt land (actual count)		3,200	
9/	less: Acres of Platted Single Family Lots (actual count)		1,300	
10/	less: Acres for Future Places of Worship and Social Org. (actual = 600 acres)		700	
11/	less: Major Easements (Natural Gas, Electric & Petroleum) (actual count)		1,000	
12/	less: Acres for Future Streets (0%, 10%, 18.5%)		4,900	
13/	less: Acres for New Schools (H=45, M=55, E=70; actual = 1,000 acres)		1,000	
14/	less: Acres for New Parks (based on SDC fees)		1,300	
15/	less: New Urban Areas (actual net of ENV, future streets and dev. land)		7,900	
16/	Net Vacant Buildable Acres (NVBA) - total		14,800	
Net Vacant Buildable Acres (NVBA) by Type (less-New Urban Areas):			Metro UGB	
17a/	Net Vacant Buildable Acres - Mixed Use Residential (MUR)		1,000	
17b/	Net Vacant Buildable Acres - Residential		6,300	
		Residential CAPACITY Assumption		
Residential Housing Supply Assessment - Metro UGB		Low	Baseline	High
18/	Dwelling Unit Capacity of Vacant Land at Local Zoning (or Plan) - 2008	62,500	62,500	62,500
18a/	less: High-density MFR products not market feasible within next 20 years	(18,400)	(18,400)	
19/	add: Res. Development in vac. Mixed Use Districts (MUR)	28,600	28,600	28,600
20/	less: Capacity Lost to SFR Underbuild @ 5%	(2,200)	(2,200)	(2,200)
21a/	add: Res. Development Capacity on ENV land (no. taxlots wholly in Title 3	100	100	100
21b/	add: Res. Development Capacity on Title 13 areas (80% of zoned capacity	19,300	19,300	19,300
22/	add: Units from Platted Single Family Lots under 3/8 acre (actual count)	8,800	8,800	8,800
23/	add: Units from Residential Refill @ 33%	73,900	86,600	99,500
23a/	add: Units from Residential Refill @ 40% (addition of 7% more)			21,100
23b/	add: Potential Units from Subsidized Residential Refill			71,100
24/	add: Estimated Capacity from New Urban Areas	48,000	48,000	48,000
25/	less: New Urban Development not yet market feasible	(24,000)	(24,000)	
26/	Subtotal: Dwelling Unit Capacity Supply Range	196,600	209,300	356,800
		Low Supply - High Demand		Low Demand - High Supply
27/	Net Need in Residential Dwelling Units (deficit):	(104,900)	(53,100)	132,800

**Pg. 128:**

Insert the following text after the second-to-last paragraph on the page:

“Through the year 2030, counting only the “solid” capacity, there is a need for additional capacity to accommodate between 27,400 to 104,900 households.”

**Appendix 7, pg. 3:**

Revise the table to include median household income levels for the eight household types. Include this information throughout the appendix.

**Appendix 8:**

Add remaining data tables that were missing in the draft report (tables 4.1AB, 4.1C, and 5.1)

**Appendix 8, pgs. 20 and 21:**

Correct tables 303.1a and 303.1b to reflect potential need for government assistance at more price levels. Corrected tables to appear as follows:

Figure 303.1a: owner-occupied dwelling units by price and housing type (2005 and 2030)

<b>Owner-occupied dwelling units</b>							
	<b>Total dwelling units</b>			<b>Detached Housing</b>		<b>Attached Housing</b>	
Approx. dwelling value	Year 2005	Year 2030	Difference in dwelling units 2005 to 2030)	Single-family and manufactured units	Manufactured units in parks	Single family units	Apartments, townhouses, condos
< \$150,000	30,259	44,411	14,152	A	A	A	A
\$150,000 - \$200,000	27,191	26,954	(237)	A	A	A	A
\$200,000 - \$250,000	31,796	15,301	(16,495)	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT
\$250,000 - \$300,000	21,442	30,657	9,215	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT
\$300,000 - \$400,000	44,089	41,522	(2,566)	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT
\$400,000 - \$500,000	49,363	52,167	2,804	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT

\$500,000 - \$750,000	58,18 4	107,6 13	49,429	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT
> \$750,000	96,29 4	265,8 20	169,527	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT
Total Units	358,6 17	584,4 45	225,828	116,848	*	*	108,980



Figure 303.1b: renter-occupied dwelling units by price and housing type (2005 and 2030)

<b>Renter-occupied dwelling units</b>							
	<b>Total dwelling units</b>			<b>Detached Housing</b>		<b>Attached Housing</b>	
Approx. monthly rent	Year 2005	Year 2030	Difference in dwelling	Single-family and manufactur	Manufactured units in parks	Single family units	Apartments, townhouses
< \$400	43,16	19,19	(23,972)	A	A	A	A
\$400 -	18,96	31,92	12,958	A	A	A	A
\$475 -	25,51	25,81	298	A	A	A	A
\$550 -	27,47	24,53	(2,948)	A	A	A	A
\$625 -	24,85	38,48	13,630	A	A	A	A
\$750 -	34,35	43,00	8,641	A	A	A	A
\$900 -	13,31	40,88	27,566	A	A	A	A
> \$1,100	26,03	64,72	38,686	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT	MRKT
Total	213,6	288,5	74,861		*	*	73,185

**Appendix 8, pgs. 20 and 21:**

Edit note that accompanies tables 303.1a and 303.1b to read as follows:

“A” denotes housing that would be partially assisted, given the dwelling unit value. It is a question for policy makers how many of these units will receive government assistance. As of November 2007, 10,608 households in the tri-county area received Section 8 vouchers.

**Pgs. 133 and 135:**

Correct data labels on pie charts (charts for high growth erroneously show the same percentages as low growth).

Agenda Item Number 5.0

**CONGESTION PRICING PILOT PRESENTATION**

Metro Council Work Session  
Tuesday, December 1, 2009  
Metro Council Chamber