

# MINUTES OF THE METRO COUNCIL MEETING

February 12, 1998

Council Chamber

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

Councilors Absent: Patricia McCaig (excused)

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** convened the Regular Council Meeting at 2:03 p.m.

## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

None.

## 2. CITIZEN COMMUNICATION

**Art Lewellan, 3205 SE 8th #9, Portland OR 97202**, reviewed the latest developments for the LOTI east bank alignment design alternate to the South North Light Rail. To Tri-Met's original objection to the LOTI design, the transfers created in Brooklyn, the OMSI district and the Rose Quarter, he answered that his plan did include a downtown destination but served eastside destinations first and ended at the Galaria turnaround. He countered that the problem of transferring was entirely related to the amount of time waiting to transfer and felt that Tri-Met did not understand or apply this fundamental transit principal. He said busses connected to the eastside lightrail failed to attract sufficient ridership because most have service frequencies of one-half hour or more. He felt the system was geared toward people who drove to park and ride lots and not to people who had to transfer from bus to lightrail. He felt LOTI would reduce the cost of the South North lightrail while building proper connections with the savings. He reiterated his plan for saving time and money.

**Councilor Washington** appreciated Mr. Lewellan keeping the Council informed.

**Councilor McFarland** said that she shared Mr. Lewellan's view of the problem that it was not the time spent in transporting yourself but the time spent in waiting for the transfers to buses and MAX that ultimately added up to her riding public transportation less often than she would if she didn't have to wait so long. She felt this was a very important issue.

**Mr. Lewellan** said he understood that Union Pacific was considering redoing tracks along that corridor and that he was more interested in building more light rail instead of more expansive lightrail.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** complemented Mr. Lewellan on his consistency with new information for the meetings. He asked if Mr. Lewellan had submitted his downtown components to the City of Portland, Department of Transportation and noted that Council had listened and appreciated his efforts. He said the information had been given to Metro staff and really looked at.

**Councilor Morissette** asked Councilor Washington if the Transportation Planning Committee had looked at Mr. Lewellan's design.

**Councilor Washington** responded that they had not analyzed his design specifically but had the information and would look at it.

**Councilor Morissette** said that, when he was a member of the Transportation Planning Committee, they had looked at the design and found that there would not be enough ridership on the eastside location. He asked if it would be worth the analysis to see if that had changed.

**Councilor Washington** continued that Mr. Lewellan's information would be evaluated and if it came up that Mr. Lewellan's information was not applicable, he would say so.

**Councilor Morissette** said there had been a discussion about limited dollars for study.

**Councilor Washington** said that decision would be made in the next 2-3 weeks.

**Councilor Morissette** said the crux of the question was, is there a reason we should spend millions of dollars to study the eastside location or not.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said since he had attended JPACT, he could respond to Councilor Morissette's question. There were several members of JPACT that stated they were interested in the east bank alignment. He felt that Mr. Lewellan had some good points about alternatives.

**Councilor Morissette** said in response to Mr. Lewellan's ongoing process, the experts seemed to think that in order to get ridership, probably the alignment they were looking at made the most sense.

**Councilor Washington** said that he felt the appropriate thing to do would be to schedule a Transportation Planning Committee to review Mr. Lewellan's design. He would make sure the transportation department would be available.

**Mr. Lewellan** said he would like to be part of that discussion..

**Councilor Washington** said that the meetings were open to all and he would be invited to attend.

### **3. EXECUTIVE OFFICER COMMUNICATIONS**

None.

### **4. MPAC COMMUNICATION**

**Councilor McLain** said there will be MPAC members attending the Council meeting on February 26, 1998 Council Meeting to hear the Title III work.

**Councilor Naito** updated the Council on the issue of RFP and that it should have already been distributed to Council. She said the reordering proposal in terms of master planning would be tabled until the Title III work had been done and the legal positions on the reordering had been received. She suggested that there should be another evening public hearing on the water issues, perhaps in early April.

### **5. CONSENT AGENDA**

5.1 Consideration meeting minutes of the February 5, 1998 Regular Council Meeting.

**Motion:** **Councilor Washington** moved to adopt the meeting minutes of February 5, 1998 Regular Council Meeting.

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

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

## 6. ORDINANCES - FIRST READING

6.1 **Ordinance No. 98-728**, Amending the FY 1997-98 Budget and Appropriations Schedule by transferring \$51,623 from Contingency to Personal Services in the Zoo Operating Fund to provide for staffing of the new facilities associated with the Oregon Project; and Declaring an Emergency.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** assigned Ordinance No. 98-728 to the Regional Facilities Committee.

## 7. ORDINANCES - SECOND READING

7.1 **Ordinance No. 97-710**, For the Purpose of Establishing a Coordinated 2017 Population Forecast for Use in Maintaining and Updating Comprehensive Plans.

**Motion:** **Councilor Morissette** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 97-710.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Naito** asked for a point of personal privilege indicating that she had an agenda which she had been working from and now there was another one that was different. She asked that next time she could have the revised agenda say "revised" and have someone let Council know they were revised.

**Councilor Morissette** explained that the expectation of the 2015 - 2017 were the population numbers that were being dealt with in Growth Management.

**Councilor McFarland** said, with the apologies to Councilor Naito, she just decided this would be an addition that she could support. She said in the interest of fairness.

**Councilor Naito** said that she believed there was a city in a floodplain that had a projection not to increase their growth, in this kind of instance growth would not be encouraged.

**Councilor McFarland** said she guessed that this did not include someone who had something that stopped them from doing it.

**Councilor McFarland** read the projections into the record. She said maybe something needed to be added to the second paragraph to say "within the limits of the environmental constraints".

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked if Councilor McFarland was offering an amendment. Councilor McFarland moved the following:

**Motion to Amend:** **Councilor McFarland** moved to amend Ordinance No. 97-710 with the following language: "These projections estimate aggregated County growth only over the planning period. These projections make no estimate of the projected population trends of individual cities.

This ordinance did not authorize any city to include in a comprehensive plan or land use regulation any projection for zero growth or a declining population.

Additionally, no city may avoid taking its fair and appropriate share of the regions growth consistent with State and regional law."

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

**Discussion:** **Mr. Mark Turpel** said he had not seen anything on it but his concern was that the smaller the geography, the trickier and the more out on a limb you would be in terms of any long term kinds of things. If there was a policy issue to be addressed, he would be happy to try to facilitate it.

**Councilor McLain** said this issue that was before Council today, was not discussing change of methodology or figures reviewed and use, but was a legal responsibility to update our population forecast. She felt if Council wanted to talk about methodology or fair share, this was not the ordinance to do it in. She felt this amendment did not fit the document.

**Councilor Morissette** said he had concerns in Committee that was all it would do. He said now additional information made people think it would do more. He said what Councilor McLain was saying was not exactly what the people were concerned about and felt it would be appropriate to have them discuss the point.

**Councilor McFarland** said this addressed the basic Code of Metro without it being included in the document. If the document circumvented the basic Code of Metro, it should be included in the document. If the majority felt it was not the place but they were willing to consider this kind of legislation in a different setting, then she would be willing to settle for that. She felt the issue needed to be addressed. She felt it should be reiterated right here.

**Councilor Washington** asked if there had been any discussion about the amendment before the Growth Management Committee.

**Councilor Morissette** responded that the committee had not reviewed the amendment but the particular concerns that the amendment spoke to had been discussed. He encouraged discussion of the aforementioned issues at Council.

**Councilor Washington** said he was not prepared to discuss the amendment if it had not been before committee. He recommended having Growth Management Committee discuss it first.

**Councilor Naito** said they had worked on this ordinance and it was ready to be passed. She did suggest testimony be taken before voting. She did not feel it needed to go back to committee.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that this had to be settled whether it went back to committee or not.

**Mr. Mark Turpel** said if the Council felt this needed to be clarified, he felt this could be added as a clarifying statement without any problems.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said in terms of the document a delay of a week or two in the approval of the ordinance did not put the work product at risk.

**Mr. Dan Cooper**, Legal Counsel, said no that would not be a problem.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-710.

**Mr. Ed Starkie**, Leland Consulting, representing the Halton Company said he had brought some reservation about the numbers before. Some things had changed since 1997, for instance, jurisdictional numbers had changed while the county numbers remained somewhat consistent. If these numbers did not apply to the cities, he strongly urged the clarification be added because the express purpose of this was to provide numbers for planning purposes. He also noted a significant change in the proposed land supply for the next 30-40 years. Given that difference, he suggested that Dennis Ye take a look at the numbers again with regard to supply and demand of land.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked about one of Mr. Starkie's charts regarding the current trend line and the expected one.

**Mr. Starkie** responded the population estimates from last January only ran up to 2015 and even then there was a difference of almost 2000 population.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said he was positively disposed to the changes but wanted to make sure he was very clear before the language was added.

**Councilor McLain** said she was amazed by this. She said they were talking about forecasting and best guess scenarios and should remember that it was not straight lined and parts of the formula were put in to deal with some other issues relevant. They felt the last 5 years could be reviewed but unless the original document was reviewed, the language here was not going to help. She felt it was an editorial comment.

**Mr. Starkie** said that he saw different jurisdictional numbers. If they were consistent with 2015, he would not be here.

**Councilor McLain** said the TAZ issue and how it related would change with capacity and other items.

**Mr. Starkie** said when you get to the jurisdictional level the model produced statistical anomalies which were not realistic.

**Councilor McLain** said the purpose was to establish a coordinated population forecast for use in maintaining and updating comprehensive plans so it would change from year to year.

**Mr. Starkie** said absolutely, and the overwhelming parts of the Urban Reserves were in Clackamas County and none of the growth was occurring there.

**Councilor McLain** suggested coming to talk with Council about his issue, but this document was not the problem.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said this was the time for personal comments as it was public testimony.

**Councilor McLain** said that in 7 years she had not dealt with an issue like this before and she felt that this issue should be put off a week.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said this will be set aside for a week but there were other citizens who wished to testify.

**Councilor Naito** asked for a point of information, she felt that it was appropriate thing to do and thanked Mr. Starkie for coming. She said before an ordinance was adopted, there certainly needed to be public involvement.

**Mr. Starkie** said the last time he was here he was assured that these would not be used for looking at city projections. Since then he had read the backup documentation that talked about the reasons DLCDC was asking for the projections and was back to reiterate the concerns.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said Mr. Starkie's concerns were very well founded.

**Councilor Washington** said with all due respect to the Council he would like to hear the public testimony without getting into a heated dialogue about what they said.

**Mr. John Weigant**, 429 N. Bridgeton Rd #B, Portland, OR 97217 expressed two concerns, one: was the econometric projections valid, and, two, at the detail level, these changes could easily be carried out in a week. He noted Exhibit A, the Tri-County total for the year 2020 projected 1,8767,396 people in the region. He also noted the estimates were rounded to the nearest 5000 and the projections for 30 years hence were to the nearest person. As a technical suggestion, he said rounding all of the numbers to the nearest 1000 because there was a public perception when using the numbers that if they were accurate to the last person they appeared to have a precision to them that was simply not there. He said the importance to the econometric projections and their resulting population projections were so vital to the future of the region that this deserved a very careful study even if it required a revision in planning. He felt that 7 year old econometric projections were suspect at best.

**Ms. Wendie Kellington**, Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, 1211 PacWest Center #1700 Portland OR 97204 spoke representing the Halton Company. She said she was very concerned about the projection numbers and had been for some time. She said she wanted the Council to know that getting to the bottom of the numbers had not been easy. The populations projection did not appear to reflect the important legal and policy decisions that the Council had made over the last year and half. She said Council should be very careful before adopting something like this.

**Councilor Naito** said that what she heard Ms. Kellington saying was that policies Council had adopted would change this. They may be in a catch 22 with the projections vs. the need.

**Ms. Kellington** said there was a statute that required Council to include population projections that could be included within city and county comprehensive plans. She said the population projections were a planning tool to decide where the region's growth would take place.

**Councilor McLain** asked Ms. Kellington if these projections were spiking up in the wrong way or were too low.

**Ms. Kellington** responded that she did not think the projections fairly allocate the growth of the region consistent with Council's policy decisions.

**Councilor McLain** asked if Ms. Kellington disagreed with the model that had been used.

**Ms. Kellington** said she had been trying for 2 weeks to figure out what model had been used.

**Councilor McLain** said that Council would be happy to share that as it had been in the public arena for over 5 years.

**Ms. Kellington** said this model was different.

**Councilor McLain** said no it wasn't and she and Dennis would be welcome to come to her office for an explanation. She asked for separation of the three issues Ms. Kellington was bringing to this meeting. She said the issue of not understanding the model could be fixed. She asked if the second issue, the concern about how the numbers changed from county to county or overall as far as totals, was a disagreement with the totals or with the way the information was being displayed.

**Ms. Kellington** said Council had made a whole lot of important decisions and an auditor coming in to look at the numbers would discover that those decisions were not reflected here but rather there was an important subset of policy decisions reflected in these population projections and allocations that were inconsistent with those decisions.

**Councilor McLain** said she understood at least the kernel of the question.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the public hearing and asked for general discussion.

**Councilor Morissette** suggested that Mr. Turpel take the time with Mr. Ye to work out the issues with Mr. Weigant. Mr. Turpel agreed.

**Councilor Washington** suggested, when the numbers were not understood, those people should be helped to understand.

**Councilor Morissette** clarified that he had been going at this for a while and he had faith that the answers were appropriate. He said he would be available for discussion and explanations of the numbers.

**Mr. Mark Turpel** said what was before the Council today was forecasts of how many people to accommodate by the year 2017. He noted that Ms. Kellington talked about allocations, in no way did this ordinance speak to allocations. There were allocations at the local jurisdictions that would be discussed at TPAC. In regard to the forecast itself, this was an econometric model and driven by estimates of sector by sector analysis of jobs that would be available at that time. He noted that rounding to the nearest 1000 was a great idea and he also thought that should be done. He mentioned that the numbers before Council today would not be incorporated into comprehensive plans.

**Councilor Naito** said the difficulty she saw was that the forecast may be based on historical trends and what Council was trying to do was to do things completely differently. She felt adopting these forecasts now would be perpetuating the use of historical trends. She suggested using a shorter projection time.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said that was one of the big decisions before Council.

**Councilor McLain** said to that issue, Mr. Turpel did an excellent job explaining the difference between this ordinance and the actual allocated numbers that would be coming before Council. She said the econometric model was knocking backwards as it had both historic and prospective information such as possible jobs. She felt it was a forward look and not just a historic past. It was different than the allocations that TPAC would be looking at in the future.

**Councilor Morissette** said he had some concerns at the committee, he thought it was good to move ahead slowly.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** continued the item with an open motion and second to next week's agenda for further discussion and possible action.

**Vote:** The vote on the amendment and the main motion were delayed to the next week's Council meeting.

7.2 **Ordinance No. 97-719A**, Amending the FY 1997-98 Budget and Appropriations Schedule by Transferring .50 FTE from the Office of Citizen Involvement and .50 FTE from the Growth Management Department to the Office of Public and Government Relations in the Support Services Fund to Provide Additional MPAC and MCCI Committee Support, Modifying the Funding Source of the Position, and Declaring an Emergency.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 97-719A.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** said the summary on the staff report explained the intent of this ordinance. She said the Executive Officer recommended adoption of this ordinance and it had passed out of committee.

**Councilor McFarland** supported the ordinance and spoke of its importance. She urged support.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 97-719A.

**Kay Durtchi, MCCI President**, urged the Council to vote yes and stated the need for staffing the MCCI.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the public hearing.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.3 **Ordinance No. 98-721A**, For the Purpose of Amending Ordinances No. 96-647C and 97-715B to Revise Title 6 Recommendations and Requirements for Regional Accessibility.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Ordinance No. 98-721A.

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



**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** reviewed the Ordinance for the Council. She recommendation passage of the ordinance although she had deep concerns about the street areas and striped bike lanes.

**Councilor Morissette** said he had major concerns about so much emphasis in this document being on alternative modes of transportation. He believed the congestion this plan called for would upset people very much. For example, Level F represented 2-3 hours a day when 13 mph would be a maximum speed on the highways. He said that would not be acceptable by citizens who mostly travel by automobile.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** opened a public hearing on Ordinance No. 98-721A. There being nobody to speak, Presiding Officer Kvistad closed the public hearing.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said Councilor Morissette spoke very eloquently to one of his concerns.

**Councilor McLain** closed by saying that this had been through regional review and those cities and counties had some concerns about it. Some of these amendments were to help with those issues and help keep parallel to the Regional Framework Plan. She felt those concerns had been addressed and this would take care of the needs of all of the communities.

**Vote:** The vote was 4 aye/ 2 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette and Presiding Officer Kvistad voting no.

## 7. RESOLUTIONS

7.1 **Resolution No. 97-2587**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of Elaine Wilkerson to the Position of Director of the Growth Management Department.

**Motion:** **Councilor Morissette** moved to adopt Resolution No. 97-2587.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Morissette** said there had been discussion in committee and they felt Ms. Wilkerson brought a lot of experience to this incredibly difficult position. He urged an aye vote.

**Councilor Washington** agreed and urged approval.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said he concurred.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.2 **Resolution No. 97-2588**, For the Purpose of Appointing Members to the Water Resources Policy Advisory Committee.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Resolution No. 97-2588.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** reviewed the resolution. She urged approval of Michael Reed from Clackamas County Utilities, Gregory Robart from Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Becky Krieg from Portland Bureau of Environmental Services, Bill Fujii as an alternate for the Oregon Water Resources Department, and Ella Whelan as alternate for Clackamas County Utilities. She said these people had been appointed by their agencies to serve on the committee.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

7.3 **Resolution No. 98-2593**, For the Purpose of Confirming the Appointment of James E. Diamond, Jr. and John F. Fryer to the Investment Advisory Board.

**Motion:** **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2593.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McFarland** said she was very comfortable with having them on the advisory board for investment. She urged an aye vote.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.4 **Resolution No. 98-2598**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Release of RFQ #97R-48-REM for Analytical Laboratory Services.

**Motion:** **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2598.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McFarland** reviewed the resolution and the requirements it met. She urged its passage. She asked Mr. Cooper if they needed to confirm.

**Mr. Cooper, Legal Counsel**, said in the resolution the Council was authorizing the Executive Officer to execute a contract with the most qualified and cost effective proposer. He said any appeal would come to Council.

**Councilor McFarland** urged an aye vote.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

7.5 **Resolution No. 98-2601**, For the Purpose of Filling a Vacancy on the Traffic Relief Options Task Force.

**Motion:** **Councilor McLain** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2601.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McLain** said this would fill a vacancy on the Traffic Relief Options Task Force with Albert Bullier, Jr., if confirmed today.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

7.6 **Resolution No. 98-2605**, For the Purpose of Authorizing the Auditor to Release a Request for Proposals and Execute a Contract for Independent Audit Services.

**Motion:** **Councilor McFarland** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2605.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor McFarland** said this would give the auditor permission to go ahead with RFPs for independent auditor services which was required by the state. She urged an aye vote.

**Councilor Morissette** asked if this was a request to raise the dollars by 14%. He felt it was important to follow the budget.

**Ms. Alexis Dow, Metro Auditor**, said the 14% was actually an error. This resolution asked for permission to go out for a three year contract. They took the figure from the previous resolution 3 years ago and increased it by 10% which was 3% compounded over the 3 years.

**Councilor Morissette** said his basic disagreement was that he was concerned about the current budget not being able to meet it.

**Ms. Dow** pointed out that they were under contract right now, this expired in March 1998. She had increased the percentage with an emphasis to price but it was a competitive market and she would get the best price she could.

**Councilor McLain** said that they had asked similar questions at committee. Ms. Dow was unable to attend the meeting and her assistant answered the question for them that it was a reasonable cap.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** asked if the error was in the staff report and not the document.

**Councilor Morissette** said the percent was not nearly as important as the fact that conflicting priorities with Growth Management and other things. He said the problem was not that we would not get our money's worth. He felt the budget should be followed and he would not be so flexible in allowing the request.

**Vote:** The vote was 5 aye/ 1 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed with Councilor Morissette voting no.

Council Meeting was recessed and Contract Review Board was convened.

## 8. CONTRACT REVIEW BOARD

8.1 **Resolution No. 98-2591**, For the Purpose of Extending the Current Contracts for the Metro 401(k) Salary Savings Plan with William M. Mercer, Inc. (Recordkeeper) and Northwestern Trust (Trustee) to Complete Conversion to the Vanguard Group.

**Motion:** **Councilor Morissette** moved to adopt Resolution No. 98-2591.

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

**Discussion:** **Councilor Morissette** said that Vanguard was an excellent company and urged support.

**Councilor McFarland** said she agreed.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** said he knew how hard Andy Cotugno and his group worked for this and thanked the team for their hard work.

**Vote:** The vote was 6 aye/ 0 nay/ 0 abstain. The motion passed unanimously of those present.

**Presiding Officer Kvistad** closed the Contract Review Board and reconvened the Metro Council Meeting.

## 9. COUNCILOR COMMUNICATION

None.

## 10. ADJOURN

There being no further business to come before the Metro Council, Presiding Officer Kvistad adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

Prepared by,

Chris Billington  
Clerk of the Council

Document Number	Document Date	Document Title	TO/FROM	RES/ORD
021298c-01	2/12/98	“Please insert the following language in Ordinance No. 97-710 Coordinated 2017 Population Forecast for use in Maintaining and Updating Comprehensive Plans”	TO: Metro Council FROM: Councilor McFarland	Ordinance No. 97-710
021298c-02	2/12/98	“Questions Concerning Ordinance No. 97-710, Coordinated 2017 Population Forecast for use in Maintaining	TO: Metro Council FROM: Unknown	Ordinance No. 97-710

and Updating  
Comprehensive  
Plans.”