



600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Council meeting agenda

Thursday, September 5, 2024

10:30 AM

Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber,
<https://zoom.us/j/615079992> Webinar ID:
615 079 992 or 888-475-4499 (toll free)

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call**

2. **Public Communication**

3. **Consent Agenda**

- 3.1 Resolution No. 24-5429 For the Purpose of Appointing
Members to the Tri-County Planning Body

[RES 24-5429](#)

Presenter(s):

Attachments: [Resolution No. 24-5429](#)

[Staff report](#)

[Exhibit A](#)

4. **Ordinances (First Reading and Public Hearing)**

- 4.1 Ordinance No. 24-1517 For the Purpose of Amending
Metro Code Chapter 2.19.120 and Repealing Metro Code
Chapter 2.19.140 To Update Procedures For
Metro-Administered Community Enhancement
Committees and to Sunset the North Portland
Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee

[ORD 24-1517](#)

Presenter(s): Noelle Dobson, Metro

Attachments: [Ordinance No. 24-1517](#)

[Exhibit A](#)

[Staff Report](#)

4.1.1 **Public Hearing for Ordinance No. 24-1517**

5. **Chief Operating Officer Communication**

6. **Councilor Communication**

7. **Adjourn**

Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and other statutes that ban discrimination. If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1890. Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1890 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. Individuals with service animals are welcome at Metro facilities, even where pets are generally prohibited. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at trimet.org

Thông báo về sự Metro không kỳ thị của

Metro tôn trọng dân quyền. Muốn biết thêm thông tin về chương trình dân quyền của Metro, hoặc muốn lấy đơn khiếu nại về sự kỳ thị, xin xem trong www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Nếu quý vị cần thông dịch viên ra dấu bằng tay, trợ giúp về tiếp xúc hay ngôn ngữ, xin gọi số 503-797-1700 (từ 8 giờ sáng đến 5 giờ chiều vào những ngày thường) trước buổi họp 5 ngày làm việc.

Повідомлення Metro про заборону дискримінації

Metro з повагою ставиться до громадянських прав. Для отримання інформації про програму Metro із захисту громадянських прав або форми скарги про дискримінацію відвідайте сайт www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. або Якщо до вас потрібен перекладач на зборах, для задоволення вашого запиту зателефонуйте за номером 503-797-1700 з 8.00 до 17.00 у робочі дні за п'ять робочих днів до зборів.

Metro 的不歧视公告

尊重民權。欲瞭解Metro民權計畫的詳情，或獲取歧視投訴表，請瀏覽網站 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。如果您需要口譯方可參加公共會議，請在會議召開前5個營業日撥打503-797-1700（工作日上午8點至下午5點），以便我們滿足您的要求。

Ogeysiiska takooris la'aanta ee Metro

Metro waxay ixtiraamtaa xuquuqda madaniga. Si aad u heshid macluumaad ku saabsan barnaamijka xuquuqda madaniga ee Metro, ama aad u heshid warqadda ka cabashada takoorista, booqo www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Haddii aad u baahan tahay turjubaan si aad uga qaybqaadatid kullaan dadweyne, wac 503-797-1700 (8 gallinka hore illaa 5 gallinka dambe maalmaha shaqada) shan maalmo shaqa ka hor kullanka si loo tixgaliyo codsashadaada.

Metro의 차별 금지 관련 통지서

Metro의 시민권 프로그램에 대한 정보 또는 차별 항의서 양식을 얻으려면, 또는 차별에 대한 불만을 신고 할 수 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. 당신의 언어 지원이 필요한 경우, 회의에 앞서 5 영업일 (오후 5시 주중에 오전 8시) 503-797-1700를 호출합니다.

Metroの差別禁止通知

Metroでは公民権を尊重しています。Metroの公民権プログラムに関する情報について、または差別苦情フォームを入手するには、www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。までお電話ください。公開会議で言語通訳を必要とされる方は、Metroがご要望に対応できるよう、公開会議の5営業日前までに503-797-1700（平日午前8時～午後5時）までお電話ください。

សេចក្តីជូនដំណឹងអំពីការមិនរើសអើងរបស់ Metro

ការគោរពសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ ១ សំរាប់ព័ត៌មានអំពីកម្មវិធីសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ Metro ឬដើម្បីទទួលបានការបណ្តឹងរើសអើងសូមចូលទស្សនាគេហទំព័រ www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights។ បើលោកអ្នកត្រូវការអ្នកបកប្រែភាសានៅពេលអង្គប្រជុំសាធារណៈ សូមទូរស័ព្ទមកលេខ 503-797-1700 (ម៉ោង 8 ព្រឹកដល់ម៉ោង 5 ល្ងាច ថ្ងៃធ្វើការ) ប្រាំពីរថ្ងៃ ថ្ងៃធ្វើការ មុនថ្ងៃប្រជុំដើម្បីអាចឱ្យគេបកប្រែភាសាសំរាប់លោកអ្នក ។

إشعار بعدم التمييز من Metro

تحتزم Metro الحقوق المدنية. للمزيد من المعلومات حول برنامج Metro للحقوق المدنية أو لإيداع شكوى ضد التمييز، يُرجى زيارة الموقع الإلكتروني www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. إن كنت بحاجة إلى مساعدة في اللغة، يجب عليك الاتصال مقدماً برقم الهاتف 503-797-1700 (من الساعة 8 صباحاً حتى الساعة 5 مساءً، أيام الاثنين إلى الجمعة) قبل خمسة (5) أيام عمل من موعد الاجتماع.

Paunawa ng Metro sa kawalan ng diskriminasyon

Iginagalang ng Metro ang mga karapatang sibil. Para sa impormasyon tungkol sa programa ng Metro sa mga karapatang sibil, o upang makakuha ng porma ng reklamo sa diskriminasyon, bisitahin ang www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Kung kailangan ninyo ng interpreter ng wika sa isang pampublikong pulong, tumawag sa 503-797-1700 (8 a.m. hanggang 5 p.m. Lunes hanggang Biyernes) lima araw ng trabaho bago ang pulong upang mapagbigyan ang inyong kahilingan.

Notificación de no discriminación de Metro

Metro respeta los derechos civiles. Para obtener información sobre el programa de derechos civiles de Metro o para obtener un formulario de reclamo por discriminación, ingrese a www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Si necesita asistencia con el idioma, llame al 503-797-1700 (de 8:00 a. m. a 5:00 p. m. los días de semana) 5 días laborales antes de la asamblea.

Уведомление о недопущении дискриминации от Metro

Metro уважает гражданские права. Узнать о программе Metro по соблюдению гражданских прав и получить форму жалобы о дискриминации можно на веб-сайте www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Если вам нужен переводчик на общественном собрании, оставьте свой запрос, позвонив по номеру 503-797-1700 в рабочие дни с 8:00 до 17:00 и за пять рабочих дней до даты собрания.

Avizul Metro privind nediscriminarea

Metro respectă drepturile civile. Pentru informații cu privire la programul Metro pentru drepturi civile sau pentru a obține un formular de reclamație împotriva discriminării, vizitați www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Dacă aveți nevoie de un interpret de limbă la o ședință publică, sunați la 503-797-1700 (între orele 8 și 5, în timpul zilelor lucrătoare) cu cinci zile lucrătoare înainte de ședință, pentru a putea să vă răspunde în mod favorabil la cerere.

Metro txoj kev ntxub ntxaug daim ntawv ceeb toom

Metro tributes cai. Rau cov lus qhia txog Metro txoj cai kev pab, los yog kom sau ib daim ntawv tsis txaus siab, mus saib www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Yog hais tias koj xav tau lus kev pab, hu rau 503-797-1700 (8 teev sawv ntxov txog 5 teev tsaus ntuj weekdays) 5 hnuv ua hauj lwv ua ntej ntawm lub rooj sib tham.

**3.1 Resolution No. 24-5429 For the Purpose of Appointing
Members to the Tri-County Planning Body**
Consent Agenda

Metro Council Meeting Thursday,
September 5, 2024

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF APPOINTING)	RESOLUTION NO. 24-5429
MEMBERS TO THE SUPPORTIVE)	
HOUSING SERVICES TRI-COUNTY)	Introduced by Chief Operating Officer
PLANNING BODY)	Marissa Madrigal in concurrence with
)	Council President Lynn Peterson

WHEREAS, Metro Code Section 11.01.170 establishes a Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) to strengthen regional coordination to implement Metro’s Supportive Housing Services Program; and

WHEREAS, responsibilities of the TCPB include, but are not limited to, developing a regional plan that includes regional strategies to address homelessness, approving and monitoring regional investments from the Regional Investment Fund and providing guidance on operationalizing SHS values on a regional scale; and

WHEREAS, the TCPB Charter (adopted by Resolution No. 22-5267) sets out requirements for membership and requires Metro to lead a recruitment process to identify members, in collaboration with the TCPB Jurisdictional Leadership Team (also established by the Charter); and

WHEREAS, the TCPB is composed of 17 voting members, four of whom are elected representatives (with one each from the Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington County Board of Commissioners and the Metro Council); and

WHEREAS, to ensure institutional knowledge, Metro staggered the terms of the 17 initial members, with eight serving for an initial one-year term and nine serving for an initial two-year term; and

WHEREAS, on April 27, 2023, Metro Council reappointed the eight one-term members for an additional two-year term; and

WHEREAS, six of the nine members with a term expiring after the initial two-year term desired to remain on the committee and were reappointed by Metro Council on May 2, 2024, for an additional two-year term; and

WHEREAS, the TCPB currently has three vacancies and the TCPB Jurisdictional Leadership Team has recommended two members for Metro Council appointment to the TCPB, with ongoing recruitment efforts to fill the third vacancy; and

WHEREAS, the recommended committee members represent the region’s diversity, and have a broad range of personal and professional experiences related to supportive housing services; and

WHEREAS, although TCPB terms are normally two full years in length, these appointments will only serve until May 4, 2026, to align with the end date for others on the TCPB; and

WHEREAS, the shortened term is a result of delays and challenges in filling these vacancies; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council appoints two members to the TCPB for a term beginning on September 5, 2024, and ending on May 4, 2026, as set forth in Exhibit A attached to this Resolution.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 5th day of September 2024.

Lynn Peterson, Council President

Approved as to Form:

Carrie MacLaren, Metro Attorney

**Supportive Housing Services Tri-County Planning Body
Committee Member Appointments and Terms**

The Tri-County Planning Body is composed of 17 voting members. Of the 17 members, four are elected representatives from each county partner jurisdiction and the Metro Council in addition to the 13 other members. Members serve two-year, staggered terms.

The following two persons will each serve a term starting September 5, 2024, and ending May 4, 2026, and thereafter will each be eligible for two additional two-year terms:

- Yoni Kahn
- Cameran Murphy

IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 24-5429, FOR THE PURPOSE OF
APPOINTING MEMBERS TO THE SUPPORTIVE HOUSING SERVICES TRI-COUNTY
PLANNING BODY

Date: August 12, 2024
Department: Housing
Meeting Date: September 5, 2024

Presenter(s), (if applicable): Patricia
Rojas, she/her, Regional Housing Director
& Liam Frost, he/him, Deputy Director.
Length: Consent Agenda

Prepared by: Chris Pence and Valeria
McWilliams

ISSUE STATEMENT

Resolution No. 24-5429 appoints two members to fill two of three current vacancies on the Tri-County Planning Body.

The persons to be appointed are:

- Yoni Kahn
- Cameran Murphy

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends that Council adopt Resolution No. 24-5429. Through adoption of this resolution, the term for these two members will be September 5, 2024, through May 4, 2026. Delays in recruitment required staff to fill these positions after they became vacant on May 5, 2024.

IDENTIFIED POLICY OUTCOMES

Council approval will appoint members to the SHS Tri-County Planning Body as required by Metro Code Section 11.01.170, and as laid out in the TCPB Charter, approved via Metro Resolution No. 22-5267.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT & FRAMING COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Metro Code Section 11.01.170 requires Metro to convene a Tri-County Planning Body (TCPB) to strengthen regional coordination in addressing homelessness in the region. The TCPB charter (adopted by Resolution No. 22-5267) sets out requirements for TCPB membership and requires Metro to lead a recruitment process to identify members, in collaboration with Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties through the TCPB Jurisdictional Leadership Team (also established by the Charter).

The TCPB is composed of 17 voting members, four of whom are elected representatives (with one each from the Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington County Board of Commissioners and the Metro Council). To ensure institutional knowledge, Metro staggered the terms of the 17 initial TCPB members, with eight serving for an initial one-year term and nine serving for an initial two-year term. Metro Council reappointed the

eight one-year term members for an additional two-year term (Resolution 23-5329) and reappointed six of the nine two-year term members who desired to remain on the committee (Resolution 24-5411).

The Metro Housing Department's Regional Alignment team led a TCPB recruitment in collaboration with the TCPB Jurisdictional Leadership Team to fill the three TCPB vacancies. Metro has a rolling application for its three housing committees, including the TCPB. Applications are kept on file for one year and are reviewed as positions become available on the committees. Metro leveraged its own and jurisdictional partner communication channels to advertise the rolling committee application and the three vacancies on the TCPB. The Metro Housing Department's Regional Alignment team reviewed applications received by April 25, 2024, and selected candidates for recommendation to the TCPB Jurisdictional Leadership. In reviewing candidates, Metro staff considered the TCPB membership requirements articulated in Metro Measure 26-210 and the TCPB Charter. Metro staff shared all applications reviewed and recommended candidates with the TCPB Jurisdictional Team for deliberation and consensus.

The two individuals recommended for Metro Council appointment to the TCPB are listed above and included in Exhibit A to Resolution No. 24-5429. These individuals live and work throughout the region and have diverse lived and professional experience.

BACKGROUND

The Supportive Housing Services Measure (Metro Measure 26-210) recognized the regional nature of the SHS program and established a Tri-County Planning Body responsible for developing and implementing a tri-county initiative that is responsible for identifying regional goals, strategies, and outcome metrics related to addressing homelessness in the region. The TCPB is supported administratively by Metro. The TCPB's regional plan and ongoing role is to guide the investments of the Regional Investment Fund (RIF) to support the counties and Metro in achieving SHS program alignment, coordination, and outcomes at a regional level.

The TCPB's membership includes a broad range of personal and professional experience, including people with lived experience of homelessness or housing instability. The TCPB also reflects the diversity of the region. As required by Measure 26-210, at Section 6(4), membership includes people with the following experiences, perspectives and qualities:

- People from Black, Indigenous and people of color and other marginalized communities
- Culturally responsive and culturally specific service providers
- Elected officials, or their representatives, from the counties and cities participating in the regional affordable housing bond
- Representatives from the business, faith and philanthropic sectors
- Representatives of county/city agencies responsible for implementing housing and homelessness services, and that routinely engage with unsheltered people

- Representatives from health and behavioral health who have expertise serving those with health conditions, mental health and/or substance use from culturally responsive and culturally specific service providers
- Representation ensuring geographic diversity

Stipends and other supports for participation are available to TCPB committee members.

ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit A to Resolution No. 24-5429.

**4.1 Ordinance No. 24-1517 For the Purpose of Amending
Metro Code Chapter 2.19.120 and Repealing Metro Code
Chapter 2.19.140**
Ordinance

Metro Council Meeting
Thursday, September 5, 2024

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING METRO)	ORDINANCE NO. 24-1517
CODE SECTION 2.19.120 AND REPEALING)	
METRO CODE SECTION 2.19.140 TO UPDATE)	Introduced by Chief Operating Officer
PROCEDURES FOR METRO-ADMINISTERED)	Marissa Madrigal in concurrence with
COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEES)	Council President Lynn Peterson
AND TO SUNSET THE NORTH PORTLAND)	
REHABILITATION AND ENHANCEMENT)	
COMMITTEE)	

WHEREAS, Metro Code Chapter 5.06 requires a solid waste community enhancement program at certain solid waste facilities, including Metro's own transfer stations, to rehabilitate and enhance the area around the solid waste facility; and

WHEREAS, solid waste community enhancement programs must be administered by a solid waste community enhancement committee that establishes the enhancement area boundary, adopts bylaws, and develops a process for soliciting and selecting community enhancement projects, among other responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, Metro currently administers only the Metro Central Station Community Enhancement Program, but Metro Code Chapter 5.06 provides for the possibility that Metro could administer additional solid waste community enhancement programs in the future; and

WHEREAS, membership of the Metro Central Station Community Enhancement Committee (“MCSCE”) is currently prescribed by Metro Code Section 2.19.120, and the membership requirements under this Section limit opportunities for diverse community members to participate in civic engagement opportunities; and

WHEREAS, the amendment of Metro Code Section 2.19.120 advances equity goals and principles as articulated by Metro’s 2030 Regional Waste Plan, including making investment decisions in partnership with impacted communities; and

WHEREAS, the North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee as adopted by Metro Ordinance No. 00-860A, Sec. 1, is no longer in existence due to closure of the St. John’s Landfill and subsequent expenditure of all remaining community enhancement funds; now therefore,

THE METRO COUNCIL ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

1. Metro Code Section 2.19.120 is amended as set forth on the attached Exhibit A.
2. Metro Code Section 2.19.140 (North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee) is repealed.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 5th day of September, 2024.

Lynn Peterson, Council President

Attest:

Approved as to Form:

Georgia Langer, Recording Secretary

Carrie MacLaren, Metro Attorney

New language for Chapter 2.19.120 is indicated by underlined text, and deleted language is indicated by ~~strikethrough~~ text.

2.19.120 Metro-Administered ~~Central Station~~ Community Enhancement Committees (MCSCE)

- (a) Purpose. Each solid waste community enhancement program directly administered by Metro under Metro Code Chapter 5.06 must establish a solid waste community enhancement committee as set forth in this Section ~~It is the policy of the district to support a community enhancement program in the area where the facility is located. of Metro Central Station, 6161 N.W. 61st Avenue, in Portland, Oregon.~~
- (b) Membership. ~~MCSCE~~ A committee must consists of ~~seven~~ a minimum of five members to be appointed ~~and serve terms~~ as follows:
- (1) One member will be the Metro Councilor representing the district where the facility is located.
- (2) The Council President will appoint all other committee members, subject to confirmation by the Metro Council. ~~Six members to be appointed by the Council President subject to confirmation by the council. The Council President shall make appointments as follows:~~
- (A) ~~One member shall be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the Forest Park Neighborhood Association.~~
- (B) ~~One member shall be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the Friends of Cathedral Park.~~
- (C) ~~One member shall be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the Linnton Neighborhood Association.~~
- (D) ~~One member shall be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the Northwest District Neighborhood Association.~~
- (E) ~~One member shall be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the Northwest Industrial Neighborhood Association.~~
- (F) ~~One member shall be appointed from a list or lists of nominees submitted by environmental organizations that have or will have an interest in the enhancement area.~~
- (c) Chair. Each committee will be chaired by the Metro Councilor member. ~~(2) MCSCE shall be chaired by the Metro Councilor representing the Council district in which the Metro Central Station is located.~~

- (d) Nominations. Staff, with support from existing committee members, will recruit a pool of potential nominees who are invested in the enhancement area and reflect the diversity of the area's residents, businesses, organizations, and communities, along with other relevant criteria. From this pool, staff will recommend to the Council President a slate of nominees for appointment. For each nominee, staff will provide the Council President with relevant information about the nominee, including but not limited to the nominee's connection to the enhancement area, and the knowledge, skills, and experiences that qualify the nominee to serve on the committee.
- (e) ~~(3) — Vacancies. In the case of a vacancy in a non-Council position on the committee, the vacancy will be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. Council President shall solicit nominations from the same organizations that were eligible to submit nominations for the original appointment.~~
- (f) ~~(4) — In all instances, the Council President may reject any or all nominations for a non-Council position on the committee slate, and request that new nominations be submitted by the affected group.~~

IN CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 24-1517 FOR THE PURPOSE OF
AMENDING METRO CODE SECTION 2.19.120 AND REPEALING METRO CODE
SECTION 2.19.140

Date: 8/15/2024

Department: Waste Prevention and
Environmental Services

Meeting Date: 9/5/2024

Prepared by: Noelle Dobson,
noelle.dobson@oregonmetro.gov
Presenter(s): Noelle Dobson (she/her)

ISSUE STATEMENT

Metro staff seeks Metro Code changes to: 1) update the recruitment process for Metro-administered solid waste community enhancement committees to create more opportunities for a diverse range of community members to serve on these committees; and 2) repeal Metro Code Section 2.19.140 to eliminate the North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee because the solid waste community enhancement program there is no longer in existence.

ACTION REQUESTED

Staff recommends that Council adopt Ordinance 24-1517, amending Metro Code Section 2.19.120 and repealing Metro Code Section 2.19.140.

IDENTIFIED POLICY OUTCOMES

The proposed revision to Metro Code Section 2.19.120 advances regional equity by increasing representation and access to decision making for local community members and furthering goals outlined in the 2030 Regional Waste Plan and Metro's Strategic Plan to Advance of Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

POLICY OPTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER

1. Approve the ordinance as written or with amendments.
2. Do not approve the ordinance.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Council adopt Ordinance No. 24-1517.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT & FRAMING COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Overview

Metro Code Chapter 5.06 requires a solid waste community enhancement program at certain solid waste facilities, including Metro's own transfer stations, to rehabilitate and enhance the area around the solid waste facility. Since 1986, Metro has invested more than \$6 million in communities across the Portland metropolitan area through this program. Local jurisdictions and community partners help Metro to administer the grant funds in and around Forest Grove, Gresham, Portland, Oregon City, Sherwood, Troutdale and

Wilsonville. These funds come from fees collected at local waste transfer stations that are reinvested back into surrounding communities.

Community Enhancement Program Administration

Solid waste community enhancement programs may be administered: (1) by Metro directly or through a contract with a non-profit community organization, or (2) by the local government where the facility is located. Each solid waste community enhancement program must have a solid waste community enhancement committee that establishes the enhancement area boundary, adopts bylaws, and develops a process for soliciting and selecting community enhancement projects, among other responsibilities.

Currently, membership of the solid waste community enhancement committee for Metro Central Station is prescribed by Metro Code Section 2.19.120, which mandates that the committee consist of seven members, including:

- Six members appointed by the Council President subject to confirmation by the council:
 - Five appointed members selected from a list of nominees submitted by each of the five Neighborhood Associations located inside the enhancement area.
 - One appointed member selected from a list of nominees submitted by environmental organizations with an interest in the enhancement area.
- The seventh member is the Metro Councilor representing the Council district where Metro Central Station is located and also serves as the chair of the Metro Central Station Community Enhancement Committee.

As currently designed, the membership requirements create limitations for diverse community members to participate in civic engagement opportunities by requiring that most members be part of a neighborhood association. This prescription is not a requirement for any other solid waste community enhancement committees throughout the region.

To increase representation on Metro-administered solid waste community enhancement committees and to increase access to decision making, staff are proposing to amend Metro Code Section 2.19.120 to remove the requirement that most committee members are recruited through area neighborhood associations. The amendment expands recruitment opportunities to a broader range of people who are invested in the enhancement area boundary and reflect the diversity of the area's residents, businesses, organizations, and communities, along with other relevant criteria. Existing committee members and Metro staff will receive applications for committee seats and seek consensus on which applicants' responses are most aligned with the skills and experiences desired for the committee. Staff will recommend to the Council President a slate of nominees from this pool for appointment. These committee recruitment procedures will apply to all solid waste community enhancement programs that are administered directly by Metro.

Removal of 2.19.140 North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee

The North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee was established in 1986 to fund rehabilitation and enhancement efforts around the St. John's Landfill. When the landfill was closed and no longer collecting enhancement fees, the committee continued to administer the North Portland Enhancement Fund until approximately 2013. In 2012, Metro Council approved the decision by the committee to sunset the annual grant program and the remaining funds were dedicated to the North Portland Greenway Trail and capacity building grants for the North Portland area. Thus, this program and associated committee is now obsolete.

Summary

The amendment of Metro Code Section 2.19.120 will increase representation and access to decision making within the committees for solid waste community enhancement programs that are administered by Metro. This change will provide opportunity for Metro to further goals under the 2030 Regional Waste Plan and the Strategic Plan for Advancement of Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion related to increasing engagement of diverse communities in WPES programming and investments.

ATTACHMENTS

None

Materials following this page were distributed at the meeting.



Metro

Ordinance 24-1517

To amend Metro Code Section 2.19.120
and repeal Section 2.19.140

September 5th, 2024

Presenting staff: Noelle Dobson (she/her)

Waste Prevention and Environmental Services

Issue

Metro staff seeks Metro Code changes to:

- 1) Update the recruitment process for Metro-administered solid waste community enhancement committees.
- 2) Repeal Metro Code Section 2.19.140 to eliminate the North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee because the community enhancement program there is no longer in existence.

Community enhancement program

- Metro Code requires a community enhancement program at certain solid waste facilities to rehabilitate and enhance the area around the facility.
- Each solid waste community enhancement program must have a committee that establishes the enhancement area boundary, adopts bylaws, and develops a process for soliciting and selecting community enhancement projects.





Metro

Amend Code Section 2.19.120

Goals:

- Expand Metro ability to recruit enhancement grant committee members who reflect the diversity of the area's geography, residents, businesses, organizations and communities.
- Add ability for Metro to recruit committee members through multiple networks, not primarily through area Neighborhood Associations.
- Bring committee recruitment practices for Metro-led enhancement grant committees in alignment with current inclusive engagement practices.





Metro

Policy direction

Regional Waste Plan Principle:

- Community Investment: Making investment decisions in partnership with communities.

Strategic Plan to Advance Racial Equity, Diversity and Inclusion:

- Goal B: Increase participation of communities of color in Metro decision-making.
- Goal E: Increase use of equity criteria in resource allocation.



Proposed revisions



Metro

Amend Metro Code Section 2.19.120

- Remove the requirement that most committee members are recruited through area Neighborhood Associations.
- Add direction to recruit nominees that are invested in the enhancement area and reflect the diversity of the area's geography, residents, businesses, organizations and communities.
- Nominations will continue to be approved by the Metro Council President, with confirmation by the full Council.

Repeal Metro Code Section 2.19.140

- Section 140 refers to the defunct North Portland Rehabilitation and Enhancement Committee that was awarding grant funds generated at the St. Johns Landfill.
- This grant program and committee have not been in existence since 2017 following the closure of the landfill.




Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 6:23 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#240]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Alexi Reeve

Email * alexi.d.reeve@gmail.com

Address 
14671 SW Pinot Ct
Portland, OR 97224

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless

individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted

effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 5:15 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#239]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Anna, Lindsey, Grace, Megan Murphy, Voorhees, Kelso, Hamilton

Email * bullmtnconnect@gmail.com

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness.

Instead, it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax-paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer–distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co–locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non–emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non–profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for the programs they manage and fund.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed in communities across the County.

Is your No
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 8:42 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#244]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Carine Badrane

Email * carine_badrane@hotmail.com

Address 
Tigard

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a

measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 8:12 AM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#246]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Chris Dunn

Email * cadifani@hotmail.com

Address



15295 SW Bull Mountain RD

Tigard 97224

United States

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a

measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?


We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 6:25 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#241]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name *	Dale Sykes
Email *	sykodeinorte@gmail.com
Address	 12356 sw 132nd ct. Tigard , Oregon 97223

Your testimony

Please limit Safe Parking in Tigard to only sites away from schools, churches, play grounds, parks, etc. We need data and metrics, before and after of the surrounding areas, about crime. This is not going to only support Tigard homeless, but other cities and California homeless they are sending North to us. Please safeguard our neighborhoods.
Thank you.

Dale Sykes

Is your testimony related to an item on an upcoming agenda? *	Yes
--	-----

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 9:44 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#249]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Marti Willis

Email * martiwillis72@gmail.com

Address



15285 SW Bull Mountain Rd
Tigard, OR 97224
United States

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a

measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 9:30 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#245]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Nancy Brugato

Email * nbrugato@pcfruit.com

Address



14560 Sw nemarnik drive

Tigard, OR 97224

United States

Your testimony

This testimony is in regards to the homeless encampments Tigard is wanting to “host”. I was asked on behalf of the Bull Mountain group to submit my testimony.

Hello and thank you for hearing my testimony. I have lived in Tigard Oregon on Bull Mountain Road my whole life, 60 years. Many family and friends that I grew up with still live in the area. I also own a business in Portland, that employees roughly 450 people. What myself and our employees have had to deal with and what the city has allowed is unsettling, Oh, their hearts are in the right place, but who suffers the aftermath of their actions, me, my business, my employees, and my customers. We have homeless, good and bad citizens, all around our business and it is out of control. I bring this up because this is what will happen in Tigard if you do what the city officials did in Portland. Yes, your hearts are in the right place as well, but I guarantee you, “you build it they will come “. You do not have the Infrastructure nor the funds without taxing us more to monitor your program. Not too long ago, I attended a meeting at the church at the bottom of Bull Mountain Road where the Pastor wanted to put a homeless encampment. 99.9% of the people there were against it and for good reason. Don’t do what Portland has done and ignore your good standing citizens who work hard and pay taxes. This has nothing to do with me having compassion, you don’t know me so don’t judge me because that is not what this is about. This is about me protecting the community I have lived in my whole life. I have to see people’s

garbage, drug use, abandoned cars, etc on a daily basis on the streets in front of my business . I spend \$5,000 a month for various forms of security for my employees and customers due to the so called homeless that the city allowing them to camp there. This is NOT the solution Tigard! Please think about me and the rest of the residents that do not want Tigard to be a mini a Portland. As my parents always used to tell me, "learn from my mistakes"., Tigard, learn from Portland's mistakes, do not allow homeless encampments in Tigard.... It will NOT end well. Actually, it will end, it will end Tigard as we know it guaranteed.

One more thing, for all the people who want this, why don't they invite the homeless to their homes to live with them? They would need to monitor their behavior, comings and going etc.

Thank you for your time,

Nancy

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *


Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 10:11 AM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#247]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Nancy Helseth

Email * nancy.helseth@gmail.com

Address 
Tigard, OR 97224

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the

number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 6:39 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#242]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Susan Purfield

Email * spurfield@gmail.com

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to

engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent

(schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 8:00 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#243]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Suzan Campbell

Email * suzieklof@comcast.net

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the

number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted

effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Metro Council Written Testimony Template: Data and Livability Metrics

*edit as you see fit or simply copy/paste into the form comment section on Metro website

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

"Good Neighbor Agreements" should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City's oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and

Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Metro Council Written Testimony Template: Data and Livability Metrics

*edit as you see fit or simply copy/paste into the form comment section on Metro website

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria

should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony

related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 2:36 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#248]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Tyler Birdsey

Email * tylerbirdsey@gmail.com

Address



14665 sw peachtree drive

Tigard, OR 97224

United States

Your testimony

Thank you for considering our testimony. Over the past 8 months, we have been engaged in our local community on the topic of homelessness. We share a collective concern that safety and livability are not being considered as new projects are implemented. Rather, leaders use a reactive approach once problems arise to address negative impacts on the community. In addition, we do not see evidence that new programming is directly tied to goals of reducing local homelessness v. providing another service which may entice those in need to travel to Washington County. Finally, there does not appear to be strong longevity with data to confirm that those who participate in services achieve a lasting positive outcome like stable housing, employment, or recovery (beyond the 1-year mark).

As Washington County residents and taxpayers, we are concerned that community programs are not adequately measuring how these programs impact the communities in which they are placed. We have seen pushback in communities for Safe Parking programs, pod villages, and emergency shelters. This is due to the unfortunate reality that the population being served is an at-risk population who disproportionately struggle with drug addiction and untreated mental illness. Location criteria should be developed with this in mind. Programs serving at-risk populations should not be next door to private residences, schools, or dispensaries.

Next, we are concerned that data collection is not adequately measuring a reduction in homelessness, as defined by a

measurable reduction in PIT counts. In Washington County, the last PIT count suggested there were 773 +/- homeless individuals. Yet, Washington County has housed 2,482. While we understand that PIT counts are historically low, the number of individuals housed gives us pause that our tax dollars are being prioritized to reduce local homelessness. Instead it appears the County is using resources to provide services to those who travel from other areas in order to engage in available resources which should be prioritized to local community members. The County should be gathering and utilizing meaningful demographic data that accurately measures where individuals are coming from before engaging in tax-funded services.

Finally, we have evidence that local community residents who are in need of services are not being efficiently helped. They are contacting Community Connect and then waiting months for any tangible help, despite services being available. Then, they are required to continually call every month to ensure they are still on the waitlist. In another example, a local Safe Parking program had residents from California on their waitlist. Meanwhile, a local Tigard resident could not get a call back to be placed on the waitlist and was told it was already 40 applicants deep.

The SHS measure changes will be up for taxpayers to decide on again, and we want to see metrics to ensure we are helping solve the local problem while maintaining safety and livability for all tax paying residents.

Here are some ideas we have generated to address the three concerns shared above:

Data and Metrics:

Collect baseline data on the number of homeless individuals in local communities, not just County-wide, and commit to collecting follow-up data annually to see if programming reduces local homelessness. This task could be accomplished by the outreach workers hired by taxpayer-funded nonprofits. "By Name List" is an alternative way to collect and track community-specific data that will track inflow and outflow into communities.

Collect 911 call data before, during, and after new homeless programs are implemented to look broadly at the impact. Location specific calls can be measured to a site where a project is being considered. Categorize call data into two buckets: safety-related and livability concerns. Share this data with the community at regular intervals. We emphasize call data over police reports because we recognize that not all incidents may rise to the level of a full police report, but are worth monitoring as a measure of felt impact.

Reconsider the "success criteria" suggested by local nonprofit providers. Examine it with a critical eye. Success criteria should be directly tied to reducing local homelessness. These should measure people maintaining housing for two years or longer. Funding should be prioritized for effective programs while maintaining measurable livability.

Location Criteria:

Prioritize commercial and public property for homeless programming. Approach businesses and make a concerted effort to locate appropriate spaces for new projects. Report this progress to the community.

Place buffer-distance requirements between homeless programs and private residences, and places children frequent (schools, preschools, TTSD public bus stops, daycares, etc) to mitigate risk and prevent harm.

Refrain from co-locating shelter programs alongside other public services, such as food pantries to ensure the local community is not experiencing an influx of homeless individuals.

Community Safety Plans:

Beyond 911 or non-emergency calls, a plan should be in place for how concerned community members can report issues related to safety or livability.

“Good Neighbor Agreements” should be required to be posted on signs at the location with a phone #, QR code, etc. that community members can use to communicate concerns that may not rise to the level of a police call. In addition, expectations would be clear for all in the community.

Create mechanisms within the County agreement that can shut down or pause the program and funnel participants into other programs should the program not be effective through baseline data, livability, or success metrics.

Clarify with local non-profit providers where their responsibilities and obligations end, and where the County and local City’s oversight begins. Ensure all stakeholders, including police, understand this well. Ultimately, the County, City, and Nonprofits are together accountable for programs they manage and fund them.

Examine local policies that may be drawing homeless individuals from other states. The West Coast is dealing with homelessness at a much higher rate than other areas of the country. Why is that?

We look forward to working together to maintain safety and livability in our local community as homeless programs are considered for funding and placed into communities across the County.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *



International Alliance of
Theatrical Stage Employees
Local 28
3645 SE 32nd Avenue
Portland, OR 97202-3019
TEL 503.295.2828
WEB www.iatse28.org

August 12, 2024

Dear Mayor Wheeler, City Council, METRO and Other Interested Parties:

The Performing Arts are by definition a collaborative effort and we have before us an opportunity for mutual benefit to all involved parties. We know private entities have shown us recently, Portland is ready and able to support multiple, modern full-sized theaters, and there is no reason why we cannot move forward on multiple fronts. These plans can support and empower each other, with the Keller remaining open during the construction of a new theatre facility at PSU, and said facility then becoming home to full-sized operas, ballets, concerts, and touring Broadway productions to allow the renovation of the Keller at a safe and practical pace without the loss of jobs or detriment to local arts groups.

Having attended meetings, reviewed proposals, and spoken with the interested parties, it has become clear that the consequences of a shutdown would be unfathomable, culturally and economically. It has also become clear that said economic consequences would be of such magnitude that while direct compensation would not be impossible it would be dramatically more logical to use said funds for the construction of a second venue, and while a temporary option could be viable, investment in a permanent option would pay exponential dividends.

As Steven Sondheim once said: "Art, in itself, is an attempt to bring order out of chaos." We are all in this together, and we can have a new beacon of artistic production and education, a strengthened and preserved historical icon, and a revitalized downtown for us all. Portland can support more venues, and the city, its artists, and workers should be the ones to profit from them. The arts are for everyone, and the good of the city and its residents must be put first.

Sincerely,

The Executive Board of IATSE Local 28

3645 SE 32nd Avenue
Portland, OR 97202-3019
503-295-2828 • iatse28.org

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 20, 2024 4:00 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#237]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Clayton Madey

Email * claytonmadey@mac.com

Address



12355 SW Autumnview St

Tigard, OR 97224

United States

Your testimony

Good afternoon, my name is Clayton Madey. I have offered verbal testimony at meetings on the topic of the Sherwood UGB expansion in the past. I am submitting testimony to reiterate my position that Sherwood is in dramatic need for more lands. Residential and industrial product types have become highly constrained, which is driving up prices and driving residents and business to other markets. My focus as a commercial real estate broker is on industrial product, or "employment lands." Every single day in my professional life, I am reminded of truly how constrained industrial product really is, either by interacting with a business that has no where to go, or working with developers on land that has tripled in price in the last 5 years due to scarcity. The Sherwood market, and Portland suburbs in general, have a wonderful growth horizon ahead and they need the land to capitalize on it. If planned correctly, the new land areas will represent a benefit to Sherwood and to Oregon.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

TVG THE VALUATION GROUP

24925 SW Garden Acres Rd
Sherwood, Oregon 97140

Voice: (503) 330-8697

Dave@thevalue-group.com

Metro Council
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232

August 20, 2024

Re: Sherwood West Concept Plan Proposal

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is David Balfour, and I am a Commercial Real Estate Appraiser and am also a resident of Sherwood. As such, I would like to document my support to approve the Sherwood West Concept Plan as proposed by the Sherwood Planning Department as both a commercial real estate expert and a community member.

As an appraiser and investor, the Sherwood market has historically exhibited extremely limited employment land supply. While performing appraisal work and comparing real property sales in Sherwood, Tualatin, Wilsonville, Hillsboro, Beaverton, and other communities, it is consistently evident that Sherwood is the most constrained in terms of land supply as well as building supply. This creates barriers to market entry for tenant business owners. As an appraiser and investor, I believe my experience in these markets qualify me to understand the supply and demand constraints as well as the economic opportunity for the community of Sherwood (and the Portland Metropolitan Area as a whole). It should be noted that I have been monitoring the following potential expansion areas outside of Sherwood West:

- While there are lands in Hillsboro that were approved for industrial expansion, I personally have worked on +/-30 projects in that area over the past 18 months and know that every parcel is spoken for by a developer or users (all the way out to Jackson School Road where the UGB boundary lies). Thus, Hillsboro does not provide a substantive supply relief option.
- North Plains voters rejected expansion plans in May 2024, again providing no relief to the Portland Metropolitan area's industrial land shortage.
- On the east side, there are many transportation projects and funding constraints preventing parcels along Highway 212 from development based upon information I have gathered from multiple appraisal assignments. Again, the east side of Interstate 5 does not provide substantive supply relief options.
- Furthermore, it is frustrating to watch the growth that Vancouver and Clark County are experiencing (and benefiting) from our businesses and companies relocating across the Willamette River for a variety of reasons including supply constraints. While that Southwest Washington submarket is soaring, the Portland Metropolitan area is losing business, jobs, and tax revenue which I believe can be partially offset by suburban land supply creation in Sherwood West.

TVG THE VALUATION GROUP

24925 SW Garden Acres Rd
Sherwood, Oregon 97140

Voice: (503) 330-8697

Dave@thevalue-group.com

- I want to point out that supply is constrained with hardly any fully served industrial sites. I was shocked to recently observe offers on a property that would take +/-5 years to simply perform site work (grading and utilities) to bring online for building construction.

Similarly, Sherwood has a shortage of residential housing supply which results in the available supply being significantly priced (upward pressure) and therefore unaffordable to many. I am a paid SSD employee (Football Coach) and volunteer on the Sherwood Youth Football Association Board where I hear from many parents that home pricing in Sherwood is extreme and prevents friends and family from moving to the area. Considering the planning and positioning of the Sherwood School District (which is one of the best in the state) to provide facilities that can accommodate substantive student growth, as well as surrounding lands that can support residential development, it is critical to increase residential land supply to maximize the Sherwood School District facilities and alleviate residential housing price affordability.

Lastly, and most critically, the recent roadway infrastructure improvements at two of Sherwood primary intersections (Sunset Blvd/Elwert Rd/Highway 99W and Roy Rogers Rd/Tualatin-Sherwood Rd/Highway 99WW) as well as the commuting routes of Roy Rogers Road and Tualatin-Sherwood Road, position both employment and residential users to benefit from urban expansion areas.

In closing, I believe that the community is well positioned from an infrastructure standpoint to support these expansion plans. Furthermore, expansion as proposed will strengthen the existing community and provide a highly desirable opportunity to work/live for the Portland Metropolitan area.

Therefore, I urge the Metro Council to approve the Sherwood West Concept Plan as proposed. Thank you for reading my testimony, your consideration of this matter is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,



David E. Balfour, MAI
24925 SW Garden Acres Road
Sherwood, OR 97140
Email: dave@thevalue-group.com
503-330-8697



MULTIFAMILY NW
The Association Promoting Quality Rental Housing

Multifamily NW
16083 SW Upper Boones Ferry Rd
Suite 105
Tigard, OR 97224

Metro Council
600 NE Grand Ave
Portland, OR 97232

August 20, 2024

Dear Metro Council Members,

As the largest association of housing providers in Oregon, Multifamily NW is dedicated to ensuring that our communities thrive through sustainable growth and adequate housing supply. We are writing to express our strong support for the adoption of a high-growth forecast projection as you evaluate the urban growth strategy for the Portland Metro area. As you know, our region is currently navigating the consequences of a severe housing crisis, and it is imperative that we take bold, forward-thinking action to address the urgent need for housing.

Undersupply is the Root Cause of Housing Crisis

The Portland Metro area is experiencing an unprecedented demand for housing, which far exceeds the available supply. According to an alarming report by ECONorthwest, our region is already facing a housing shortage of more than 59,000 homes, with an additional need for 10,683 homes to accommodate our growing houseless population. Moreover, it projects that the region will require the construction of 294,853 new housing units over the next 20 years. These figures significantly surpass Metro's current estimates of 143,300 to 203,200 new units.

The numbers provided by ECONorthwest paint a stark picture of the housing crisis we are facing. By adopting a high-growth forecast projection, Metro can more accurately prepare for the higher-than-baseline growth that our region will (hopefully) experience. This proactive approach will enable us to meet the housing needs of our rapidly growing population, while also mitigating the affordability challenges that threaten the livability of our communities. And, if population growth does not proceed as expected, the land will not be impacted.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Gary Fisher

gary@multifamilynw.org

2024 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT

Andie Smith

Holland Partner Group

VICE PRESIDENT

Tiffany Wallace

Cushman & Wakefield

SECRETARY

Marcel Gesmundo

Andor Law

TREASURER

Chris Hermanski

Mainlander Property Management

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT

Josh Lloyd

Wood Residential

DIRECTORS

Jessie Dhillon

Carla Properties

Brent Ellifritz

PG Long Floorcovering LLC

Tim Jellum

Mill Creek Residential

Pam Leeper

Greystar

Dan Mason

MG Properties

Kimberly McCafferty

Lifetime Exteriors

Jennifer McCord

Princeton Property Management

Leilani Reyes Stone

HD Supply

Leah Sykes

Andor Law

Jennifer Wyncoop

Income Property Management

Furthermore, residents in the Portland Metro area are facing increasing barriers to home ownership due to the affordability consequences that our undersupply has caused. If the council adopts and implements the high-growth forecast projection, home ownership will be more attainable for communities across the region.

Portland Metro Should Welcome Responsible Development

Additionally, Metro Council should shape a new policy that recognizes the low capacity for housing development inside UGB lands and the extreme need for new housing. The current estimates indicate a surplus of +9,050 units, which we believe is unrealistic given the actual deficit of -84,000 units needed inside the UGB.

Attempting to control where and how the market will adapt can have unintended consequences. Metro should avoid imposing restrictive policies that risk pushing housing developers to other U.S. markets with fewer regulatory barriers. Instead, we should focus on creating an environment that encourages development and investment in the Portland Metro area, ensuring that we remain competitive and capable of meeting our region's housing demands.

A crucial component of addressing our housing crisis is expanding the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). By expanding the UGB, we can increase the availability of land for development, thereby helping to slow the escalating costs of housing. As we have all seen firsthand, the limited supply of land within the current UGB constrains development and drives up prices, making it increasingly difficult for residents to find affordable housing.

Expanding the UGB will not only create more opportunities for housing development but will also encourage competition, which can help slow the increase in housing costs and make living in the Portland Metro area more affordable. It is essential that we take this step to ensure that all residents have access to housing that meets their needs and budgets.

Acknowledgment of Employment Lands Considerations

While our primary focus is not directly within the commercial and industrial development sectors, we acknowledge that the availability and management of employment lands significantly impact the overall growth and sustainability of our communities. In this regard, we recommend that the Metro Council consider discounting the approximately 1,300 acres of land with slopes exceeding the 7% grade threshold, which is generally identified as the industry standard for commercial and industrial development. We have an obligation to ensure the land classified as viable truly meets the practical requirements for development.

By integrating these considerations, we believe that the Metro Council can better strategize the use of employment lands to foster balanced development, support economic vitality, and contribute positively to the community's housing and employment needs.

City of Sherwood Proposal Deserves Approval

Furthermore, Multifamily NW fully supports the City of Sherwood's proposal for expansion without any conditions. Sherwood has demonstrated a commitment to responsible growth through a rigorous public engagement process, and we trust in their ability to understand and address their community's needs. Metro should respect the decisions made by local communities and support their efforts to grow in a way that aligns with their unique vision and values.

It is crucial to trust Sherwood's expertise and ongoing community engagement process. They are best positioned to determine how to grow reasonably and responsibly, ensuring that their expansion aligns with local needs and aspirations.

Conclusion

In conclusion, Multifamily NW strongly advocates for the adoption of a high-growth forecast projection as part of the urban growth strategy for the Portland Metro area. By acknowledging the true extent of the housing crisis, rejecting restrictive development scenarios, expanding the urban growth boundary, and supporting local initiatives, we can pave the way for a more prosperous, affordable, and sustainable future for our communities.

We appreciate the Metro Council's dedication to addressing these pressing issues, and we are confident that, together, we can create a housing strategy that meets the needs of our growing region. Thank you for considering our perspective and recommendations.

Sincerely,

Gary Fisher
Executive Director
Multifamily NW



August 22nd, 2024

Marissa Madrigal, COO
Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232

Cc:
President Lynn Peterson
Councilor Ashton Simpson
Councilor Christine Lewis
Councilor Duncan Hwang
Councilor Gerritt Rosenthal
Councilor Juan Carlos Gonzalez
Councilor Mary Nolan

RE: Metro's 2024 Urban Growth Report and Sherwood's Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Request

Dear Ms. Madrigal,

My name is Preston Korst and I'm the Director of Government Affairs at the Home Building Association of Greater Portland. HBA is dedicated to maximizing housing choice for all who reside in our region by shaping an environment in which industry professionals can meet the diverse needs of all communities.

I'd like to start off by personally thanking you and the rest of Metro's planning staff, including Katherine Ciarlo, Eryn Kehe, Ted Reid, Malu Wilkinson (and many more) for hosting and facilitating the Urban Growth Report Stakeholder Roundtable. This broad and diverse group of interested parties met for two hours monthly for nearly a year to discuss and debate the central tenants of the Urban Growth Report (UGR) and the impacts it will have on our region. As HBA's representative in that group, I can say that it provided much needed dialogue and reflection space for us to discuss how we as a region wish to grow. Your willingness to provide that opportunity is greatly appreciated.

In this letter, we hope to outline our industry's perspective on the 2024 Draft UGR and to provide our unequivocal support for the City of Sherwood's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) expansion request.

For housing affordability and the overall health of our economy, HBA and many others in the housing industry urge your COO Recommendation and Metro Council to take a high-growth position when evaluating our region's land supply and housing needs in this UGR and move to approve Sherwood's UGB request without conditions.

Consider for a moment the exorbitant costs to purchase a home in our region. According to Zillow, the median home sale price in June was \$521,133 (Multnomah County), \$579,979 (Washington County), and

\$631,000 (Clackamas County). Staggering as these figures are, they come as no surprise given that Oregon is staring down a [housing deficit of 140,000 units](#). And if our goal is to advance economic justice and racial equity, then we must reverse these trends in a way that builds wealth and increases homeownership opportunities for more families who've traditionally been locked out of the homebuying market. In other words, WE ARE IN A HOUSING CRISIS.

--

UGR Question #1: Which population and growth projections should Council make?

With the UGR, we believe that the focal and starting point rests primarily on the population and growth scenarios presented in the report. While the draft contains a lot to applaud—including acknowledgements of an existing regional housing shortage, changing housing choices due to the pandemic, and the creation of newly allowed middle housing options—it still includes elements that are concerning for our industry.

For one, the report concludes that regional population growth is slowing because birthrates are dropping (which of course is an established national trend). This means that in-migrating residents will be the primary driver of our population growth, as it has been in recent years. This analysis makes sense. However, the report erroneously assumes that, “Slowing population growth also means slower job growth.” We respectfully disagree.

Though we concur that we can't necessarily change what the data tells us, we *can* choose policies that will bend the precision of that data towards a stronger economic future. In other words, if we use this growth report to prepare for strong economic and housing growth, we believe that in-migration will adapt towards a higher-opportunity future—if you build it, they will come. On the flipside, if we plan for anemic growth and limit our ability to adapt to the market, we'll just be realizing our own economic stagnation. In either case, it's a self-fulfilling prophesy.

UGR Recommendation #1: assume and position the report with the high-growth population scenario.

We feel that Metro would not only be wise, but would be making the most responsible public-policy decision to plan for growth, despite what projections may or may not suggest. Preparing with an attitude of a high-growth scenario provides Metro and local jurisdictions with more flexibility to plan for the future that will avoid future housing crises and economic stagnation. As we hear often from planners: *failing to plan is planning to fail*.

--

UGR Question #2: How should Council approach housing need and development scenarios?

To start, we want to acknowledge the fact that Metro staff included in this report an existing housing shortage of 23,700 units. While many in the housing industry would argue (with additional sources) that number is considerably low, it is still an important indication of how serious our housing crisis is to Metro. Moving on from there, we appreciate the difficult work that went into calculating our housing needs over the next 20 years. And we believe it would be misleading, if not negligent, to suggest that our region's housing needs are anything except *high*. Therefore, **we urge Metro to adopt the high-forecast housing need of at least 203,200 units over the next 20 years**. This reflects a greater sense of reality than the baseline or low-point figures hold.

Additionally, in the report, Metro also makes assumptions about not only the rate of our growth, but also *how we will and should grow*. Found on pages 38-39, the report contains several assumptions for development potentials using “illustrative demand and capacity scenarios.” While we aren’t exactly sure which data these trends were founded upon, we do feel that they all but marginalizes and unduly prevents the construction of new, single-family homes for residents. It assumes, either through economic reality or lifestyle choices, that our region’s historically strong demand for homeownership isn’t a viable scenario going forward. Again, we disagree.

And importantly, just after the limited scenarios are presented, the report goes on to say that “...it will be the market, not Metro’s UGR calculations, that determine what mix of middle housing and single-unit detached housing gets built...” Yet, in the way that the housing needs scenarios are presented, Metro is essentially asking its Council to do just that by attaching to their decision a condition and outcome which will essentially select which types of housing should get built. Housing construction is a market-driven industry, with the overwhelming majority being built by private developers. We believe that it is not within Metro’s power or provision to attempt to guide the mix of housing the market will bear, least of all with just four narrow scenarios.

UGR Recommendation #2: Metro should adopt a high-forecast housing need. Also, it should reject the growth scenarios presented in the UGR or establish an additional scenario that creates flexibility for the housing market to adapt to the demand of consumers.

A high need scenario reflects the reality on the ground and will allow policymakers across the region take actions that will address the high cost of housing in their communities. Also, we believe that the forecasted development scenarios have been created despite the fact that nearly [4 out of 5 Oregonian’s still prefer to live in a single-family home](#) versus other housing types. And it fails to recognize the power that public-policy-making has on the creation of new housing, which could make single-family entry-level homes more affordable. Lastly, it ignores the fact that the vast majority of homeownership opportunities lie in the single-family market. We believe that Metro should consider that our region’s collective desire to foster equity and economic justice will rely on the unique wealth and community-building opportunities that arise with homeownership.

City of Sherwood UGB Expansion Request

This year, the City of Sherwood is the only city requesting a UGB expansion—and we believe that it would have a tremendous impact on our region, in the form of 4,500 good-paying jobs, roughly 5,000 new homes, and the creation of hundreds of acres of parks and natural areas.

For almost two years, I had the pleasure of sitting on the Sherwood West Technical Advisory Committee which helped shape the concept planning for the area. I can say without reservation that the plan brought forward by staff, regional stakeholders, and community members has been careful, conscientious, and equitable. **We applaud the delivered outcome and encourage Metro to move forward with an approval that encompasses the entirety of the 1,291 acres as requested, without conditions.**

As Metro knows well, bringing new lands into the UGB requires focused planning, financing for infrastructure, and a building environment that can support growth. Fortunately, Sherwood is primed for just that. Over the last several years, the city has undergone extensive public engagement to develop a plan that is innovative, forward-thinking, and contains a variety of tools that will create complete and livable communities. However, adding conditions as suggested in a recent Council Session, could be

detrimental to that extensive outreach. There are serious political costs to adding conditions, not to mention the hundreds of thousands of dollars in grants and general fund dollars would be jeopardized if onerous restrictions are placed on this community-led design.

Given the continued severity of our region's housing crisis, mixed with the budding opportunities to capitalize on historic investments for local economic development—HBA and our partners in the housing sector view this request as a great example of a planning process that will bear fruit for generations. It will help empower our region to reach its housing production goals while creating an indispensable lifeline to a struggling local economy. For affordability and the overall supply of housing, the Sherwood West proposal is an undeniably smart plan that deserves the community's support and Council's unanimous vote.

In closing, we would like to thank Metro staff and Council for the dedicated service they offer to our communities. From long-range planning to affordable housing development, the work you do is not easy and the stakeholder groups you engage are broad and not always agreeable. We appreciate the efforts taken to develop the 2024 Draft UGR and to review Sherwood's 2024 UGB Expansion. And we implore you to consider the serious housing crisis we are facing when making your ultimate recommendations and decisions.

Thank you for your consideration of our testimony,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Preston Korst". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Preston Korst

Director of Public Policy and Government Affairs
Home Building Association of Greater Portland

Georgia Langer

From: Metro 2040
Sent: Tuesday, August 6, 2024 9:13 AM
To: Connor Ayers; Georgia Langer
Cc: Molly Cooney-Mesker
Council comment - FW: [External sender]Sherwood West Concept Plan

From: Jodi Tsutomi <joditsutomi@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 6, 2024 12:37 AM
To: Metro 2040 <Metro2040@oregonmetro.gov>
Subject: [External sender]Sherwood West Concept Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Dear Metro Council,

Good evening and thank you for your time. I am writing this letter in support of the Sherwood West Concept Plan as proposed and supported by the Sherwood community and Sherwood City Council.

"New" and "fresh" are two words that come to mind in regards to this comprehensive plan. New strides and fresh faces. New ideas and fresh goals. New directions and fresh opportunities. This plan offers practical, thoughtful and forward movement; with a sustainable core based on values for healthy growth, preserving open spaces and upholding the strengths and benefits inherent in Sherwood.

Three key factors of the Sherwood West Concept Plan that in my opinion highlight its vital role:

1. Positive employment growth trends at 18% from 2017-2022.
2. Promoting a steady and robust economic growth and residential housing.
3. "2024 ECONorthwest analysis North District Mixed Employment Area (MEA) of Sherwood West Concept Plan has site characteristics that make the land better suited to accomodate the industries that are growing and expanding in the Portland Metro area."

Sherwood must grow and evolve in a balanced way and I feel that the Sherwood West Concept Plan as proposed is that backbone.

Best Regards,
Jodi Tsutomi
Sherwoodian

Georgia Langer

From: Wufoo <no-reply@wufoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2024 2:23 PM
To: Legislative Coordinator
Subject: [External sender]Submit testimony to Metro Council [#238]

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

Name * Robert Galanakis

Email * rob.galanakis@gmail.com

Address



1134 SE 60th Ave
Portland, Oregon 97215
United States

Your testimony

Dear Councilor Hwang and Metro President Peterson,

I am a resident of Southeast Portland. I am my school's PTA President, on my Neighborhood Association board, and am active in climate and transportation advocacy. I am urging you to vote No on Sherwood's proposed UGB expansion.

The City of Sherwood, according to available information, has an employment–population ratio of about 50%. This is extremely low, even compared to nearby cities. This is because Sherwood is a suburb, with a high median income, far from job centers, and dependent on freeways for access. This sort of pattern of predominant single family homes, with few jobs, connected by freeways, is catastrophically bad for regional health. The reason Sherwood wants to expand its UGB is exactly because it requires continual sprawl to fund the borrowing it made in the first place.

While I appreciate Sherwood is seeking to add additional jobs and create mixed–use neighborhoods, the fact remains they must first do this within the existing city boundaries. The city has proven incapable of mixed–use neighborhoods close to jobs and schools, and has not used the tools available to rezone and redevelop. Giving them more land and hoping they 'get it right' does not make sense– and it shows in the proposed zoning, which is still predominantly low–density residential. In fact, the breakdown of zoning reflects existing Sherwood zoning quite directly. I don't know why

we would expect a better use of new land.

According to the report, Sherwood does not have a plan to fully pay for the necessary infrastructure to expand its UGB. It certainly does not have a plan to pay for increased maintenance. And Sherwood itself will be externalizing other costs of its UGB expansion, including the pollution and congestion it will impose on job centers like Portland, Beaverton, and Hillsboro. Sherwood's UGB expansion comes at the cost of further impoverishing future residents of its City and the entire Metro region.

The proposed UGB expansion works counter to Metro's Regional Goals. Rather, to accomplish Regional Goals, and even to create a healthy City of Sherwood, we must develop existing land within the UGB so we can create financially and environmentally sustainable population growth.

Is your Yes
testimony
related to
an item
on an
upcoming
agenda? *

Name *	Tanner Wardrip
Email *	Twardrip@gmail.com
Address	<input type="checkbox"/> 12051D SE Foster Road Portland, OR 97266 United States

Your testimony

Dear Oregon Metro Board,

I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the current state of Portland's public transportation system under TriMet's management. As a concerned resident and advocate for effective public transit, I find it appalling that some members of the TriMet board, who make crucial policy decisions for the organization, do not regularly use public transportation. This disconnect between decision-makers and the reality of public transit users is deeply troubling.

Regrettably, Portland's public transportation system has stagnated in innovation, ridership, and future planning. When compared to other public transit systems in the Pacific Northwest, particularly those in Seattle and Vancouver, BC, Portland's system appears to have fallen behind. This stagnation is unacceptable for a city that prides itself on sustainability and accessibility.

I firmly believe that Metro should exercise its authority, as stated in Oregon law, to hold a vote to take over the TriMet board. The board must be composed of individuals who understand the challenges and opportunities within our public transportation system from the perspective of daily users. I urge you to consider removing board members who do not regularly use public transportation and to appoint new members who do. Additionally, I propose revising the appointment requirements for TriMet board members to mandate regular use of public transit as a condition of their service.

Our city deserves a forward-thinking public transportation system that is responsive to its users' needs and led by individuals who are genuinely invested in its success. I hope you will consider my concerns and take the necessary steps to ensure that TriMet is led by a board representing and understanding the needs of Portland's public transit riders.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Tanner Wardrip

Is your testimony related to an item on an upcoming agenda? * I'm not sure

From: Terrel Smith <terrelsmith1284@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 5, 2024 6:21 PM
To: Metro 2040 <Metro2040@oregonmetro.gov>
Subject: [External sender]Sherwood West Expansion Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External source**. Do not open links or attachments unless you know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in support of the Sherwood West Expansion Plan. [Here is a link](#) to the rationale for my support. It is my opinion that this is a very good plan for the appropriate expansion of west Sherwood and fits with the logical development surrounding the Sherwood High School and other areas.

Sincerely,

Terrel Smith
Retired teacher-Sherwood High School
503-941-6085.

Request that the Metro Council:

- **Approve the Sherwood West Concept Plan as proposed by the Sherwood community. Changes to the plan threaten community support.**
- Add 340 net acres of residential land to the UGB as proposed in the Sherwood West Concept Plan.
- Add 130 net acres of flex industrial land to the UGB as proposed in the Sherwood West Concept Plan.
- Add 135 net acres of commercial and hospitality land to the UGB as proposed in the Sherwood West Concept Plan.

Background Information:

Urban Reserve designation

- Sherwood West is proposed within an Urban Reserve. Urban Reserves are lands suitable for accommodating urban development over the next 50 years.
- Land that is considered most important for commercial agriculture and forestry use is in rural reserves and not eligible for urban expansion.
- City has clearly answered question of readiness and has prepared for adding Sherwood West to the UGB.

Regional Growth Projections

- Our region is growing and is expected to add an average of 15,000 new residents per year through 2044.
- Sherwood is preparing for its share of growth through the Sherwood West Concept Plan.
- The Sherwood School District supports the Sherwood West proposal. The School District Board of Directors and the Superintendent have expressed strong support for the plan.
- Our region will add approximately 315,000 new residents and 137,000 new jobs over the next 20 years under a baseline growth scenario.

Community Engagement

- Since 2021, the City has held over 30 public meetings on Sherwood West. The public engagement process was highly publicized, thorough and inclusive. The Sherwood West vision was developed by the Sherwood community.
- The diverse range of residents and stakeholders were represented on the Community Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee.

- The Sherwood West Concept Plan has strong local support including unanimous approval from the Sherwood Planning Commission, Sherwood City Council, and Washington County Board of Commissioners.

Housing

- Sherwood and the Portland region are experiencing a housing crisis. The severe shortage of housing has increased prices and reduced affordability for all. Between 2017 and 2022, the Portland region experienced a 50.4% increase in homelessness.
- The Sherwood West Concept Plan will provide a minimum of 3,100 new units including mid-rise apartments, missing middle housing, and single-family detached residences. A minimum of 43% of new housing will be middle and multi-family housing.
- The plan proposes innovative zoning types including cottage cluster only and middle housing only zones will provide opportunities for first time home buyers and empty nesters to stay within or relocate to our region.
- Sherwood West proposes between 43% - 68% middle and multi-family housing. The range depends on how much middle housing is constructed in certain zones.

North District Employment Land

- The Sherwood West employment land provides opportunities for equitable economic growth.
- Employment land is not just about a simple supply and demand analysis. Economic development requires a land supply that enables specific industries to thrive.
- The average industrial parcel size in the metro region is 1.7-acres. Our region is facing an industrial land supply crisis similar to the housing crisis. Small BIPOC and women owned businesses are most vulnerable to rising business costs.
- The industrial vacancy rate in Washington County is 2.5% making business more expensive for key target industries. Small businesses are impacted the greatest by high industrial land costs and lease rates.
- Sherwood grew it's industrial and manufacturing base twice as fast than the region between 2017 and 2022.
- The Sherwood West site is competitive and will lead to new jobs for a growing part of the region.

Annexation and Development Phasing

- Sherwood is committed to thoughtful planning and careful growth over time.
- Approval of the UGB expansion does not immediately bring the land into the City of Sherwood. The land remains part of unincorporated Washington County until formally annexed into the City of Sherwood.
- Growth is expected to occur first at key nodes with access to infrastructure like near the new Sherwood High School.

- The Concept Plan includes a Preliminary Infrastructure Funding Strategy that describes how new infrastructure will be funded. Where current SDC rates do not cover the cost of infrastructure, a broad range of funding tools will be considered.