

Exhibit "D": Advisory Comments from Planning Commission to City Council

The Planning Commission developed this "preamble" to accompany their housing policy recommendation

The recommended goal represents the broadest statement of the community's vision to provide housing opportunities and choice for all its residents of various income levels, now and in the future. The fifteen policies are organized around four sets of housing issues – housing supply and availability, housing safety and quality, housing opportunity, and housing affordability. Each policy is a broad statement that sets a preferred direction in response to a particular set of issues. Even though each policy articulates or defines a more focused vision, each is inter-related, and in combination, all support the overall goal.

Under each policy is a set of objectives that provides more detail on the direction necessary to support the related policy. The objectives will guide the development of strategies during the life of this policy document. Not every objective is relevant, plausible, or desirable in every circumstance. There may be conflicts within the housing policies and objectives, particularly when they are applied to a smaller subarea within the larger city. To cite an example, the housing policy supports the expansion of both homeownership opportunities and rental housing opportunities. It is conceivable that both policies could be achieved at the citywide level if the overall supply of housing were increased accordingly. When these same policy objectives are applied to a smaller geographic area they must be weighed carefully against the circumstances of the particular area, the local housing market, and economic conditions. In these cases certain policy objectives will have priority over others.

Most of the provisions of the comprehensive plan are considered "balancing," that is, decisions must be made based on the cumulative weight of policy language and direction. Decision-makers – Hearings Officers, Planning Commissioners, and City Council – are often required to weigh and balance policies and objectives in order to make decisions to implement strategies. The balancing of policies is more than a numerical tally. Decisions must be made based on a careful analysis of the appropriateness and applicability of policies to the specific circumstances and facts under consideration.

In order to implement the recommended housing policies and objectives, the city needs to maintain an array of tools beyond the traditional tools

of zoning and the comprehensive plan map. Other tools include planning regulations, design guidelines, financial incentives, and community-based or area specific planning efforts.

The proposed goal, policies, and objectives provide a long-term policy framework for the entire city and for all income levels. Citywide and area specific implementation plans provide the fine-tuning needed to prioritize and apply broad policies and objectives to specific areas, and to specific income groups.

The Planning Commission is a policy body, and as such has a limited role in implementation. The Planning Commission does expect that implementing agencies will consider the prioritization and application of the housing policies and objectives when they develop and implement strategies. It is our hope that in combination, city housing strategies support the overall goal of housing choice for all residents, over time.

Exhibit "E"**Preliminary Recommendations
on Housing System Improvements****Housing Policy Update Steering
Committee (12/2/98)****Executive Summary**

The Steering Committee focused their discussion on those housing functions that could improve performance, coordination, and accountability of the entire housing system. For the most part the functions identified were those that cross bureau and agency lines of authority, or where the responsibility or accountability for performance of the function is not clear. The three inter-related functions identified for system improvement recommendations are

- **Housing System Coordination and Problem Solving** (dependent upon)
- **Housing Data Collection** (which leads to)
- **Coordinated Housing Planning and Program Delivery** (which entails)
 - Housing Research & Evaluation
 - Strategic Housing Plan
 - Comprehensive (Functional) Housing Budget
 - Resource Development

Recommendation #1: Re-establish the Interagency Housing Advisory Group (HAG).

Recommendation #2: Develop and maintain a relevant housing database to track regional and sub-market activity and city housing assistance program performance.

Recommendation #3: Establish a protocol for housing research or program evaluation (e.g. non-implementing bureau or consultant evaluates; each bureau establishes schedule and budget for program evaluation; when new programs are developed and funded, include schedule and method of evaluating program effectiveness.)

Recommendation # 4: Develop a biennial Housing Action Plan that identifies short-term priorities, strategies, target areas, and performance goals.

Recommendation #5: Establish a mechanism for citizen advice and oversight of the Housing Action Plan.

Recommendation #6: Prepare a functional housing budget tied to the Housing Action Plan.

Recommendation #7: Identify housing resource development as a top housing priority, tie it to goals identified in the Housing Action Plan, and develop financing strategies (public and private) to further goals.

Organizational Models: Even though the Steering Committee focused on functions, not on organizational structure, they considered the organizational recommendations from previous system improvement recommendations. Those efforts are briefly summarized below.

Option A Consolidation Model all functions in Single Agency (Barney-Worth ('88), Cardenas ('90), City/County Housing Delivery System Audit ('96)

Implementation All functions assigned to one agency

Option B Self-Managed Coordination (with citizen oversight) (CHAS Report on Structure ('91), Commissioner Kafoury's Housing Portfolio)

Implementation This is the current system Each Bureau/Agency retains autonomy, agrees to share data, and coordinates as necessary. Effectiveness of this model relies on commissioner interest as well as on the willingness of others outside the portfolio to cooperate and coordinate.

Option C Managed Coordination (with citizen oversight) (Original Office of Planning and Policy Development (1978-1985)/Office of Housing Policy (1985-1989), Office of Community Development Model (1992)

Implementation Assign Function of Program Coordination, data collection, and strategic planning to one bureau, preferably not an implementation bureau

Of the organizational models recommended by past studies, the Steering Committee recommends **Option C** as the organizational model that would have the greatest success at implementing the seven housing system improvement recommendations. Since a number of city bureaus have responsibility for some portion of the City's housing system, the Steering Committee recognized that more than one City Commissioner is likely to have responsibility for the performance of the housing system. In evaluating the options the Steering Committee focused on the need for City Council to establish clear lines of authority and accountability for the housing system coordination. The Steering Committee recommends that, regardless of portfolio assignment, the Mayor should designate one Commissioner as the "Commissioner for Housing," with functional responsibility for the housing system operation and coordination.

Next Steps: Ask City Council for authorization for the Housing Policy Steering Committee to continue to refine the preliminary recommendations contained in this report, and specifically

- a Expand its membership to include representatives from the Bureau of Buildings, and the Office of Finance and Administration,
- b By March 1, 1999, develop a final recommendation for City Council consideration that includes a detailed implementation plan and budget,
- c Develop a Housing Action Plan that recommends to City Council 2-year priorities, key strategies, and goals tied to the 1999/2000 budget,
- d Request that the Mayor designate a City Commissioner as the Commissioner of Housing to have functional (as opposed to organizational) responsibility for the operation of the housing system
- e Assign the designated Commissioner to serve as the Chair of the Housing Policy Steering Committee

Discussion of Recommendations:

Operating Assumptions The Steering Committee developed its recommendations based on the following assumptions

- Learn from past recommendations on housing system improvements,
- Focus on modest, politically feasible improvements, not big structural change,
- Coordinate housing system recommendations with Blueprint 2000 recommendations,
- Rely on existing citizen boards and commissions rather than create new ones (e.g. use inter-commission ad hoc groups and expand membership when necessary),
- Focus first on the functions that need improvement, not on the organizational structure,
- Define a comprehensive housing system to include direct development (HAP), project finance and technical assistance (PDC, BHCD), long-range land use and neighborhood planning (BOP), development review, maintenance and enforcement (BOB/BOP),
- Build on the interagency coordination and cooperation developed in the Housing Policy Update,
- Build on communication links among boards and commissions (Planning Commission, HCDC, PDC, HAP) that began with Housing Policy Update,
- Ensure that input and feedback loop includes neighborhood organizations and housing assistance program customers and partners (lenders, developers, residents, etc.),
- Focus on improvements that add value to the system, not perfunctory reports or window dressing

Objectives of System Improvement Recommendations:

- To increase efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the city's housing delivery system,
- To increase accountability within the city for performance of housing functions,
- To provide a system for monitoring, and periodic evaluation and update of housing system programs,
- To develop, implement, and evaluate existing and potential strategies in order to meet housing policy objectives,
- To institutionalize coordination of housing functions in an efficient manner that does not depend on specific personalities or interests of City Commissioners,
- To clarify roles of bureaus, citizen advisory bodies in policy development and implementation,

- To provide a clear process for private sector/citizen involvement in strategy development/evaluation

Recommendations:

Housing System Coordination and Problem Solving

Current System Commissioner Kafoury's Monthly Housing Managers' Meeting (PDC Housing, BHCD, & HAP)

Gaps Agencies with housing focus (BOB, BOP, and Energy) outside of Commissioner Kafoury's portfolio are not involved
Coordination happens on a project specific or "as needed" basis

Recommendation #1: Re-establish Interagency Housing Advisory Group (HAG).

Discussion From 1982 until 1991 City Housing Managers (the HAG) met regularly to coordinate housing programs and solve problems. A lead agency was responsible for calling the meetings, developing an agenda, and tracking decisions. The HAG was replaced in 1991 by the assignment of the housing bureaus to Commissioner Kafoury's portfolio.

The Steering Committee recommends that such an interagency housing team be institutionalized regardless of portfolio assignment. It would build on the coordination that has developed among the Housing Policy Management Team.

The City Council should designate the following Bureau Managers as HAG members: BHCD, PDC, BOP,* BOB,* (or proposed OPD), and HAP. The purpose of the regular HAG meeting would be to do the following:

- Information exchange
- Early Warning System
- Problem Solving
- Program delivery coordination
- First level of review of bureau of constituent requests for strategy or ordinance development (SDC charges, preservation ordinance, target area designations, etc.)

Other bureaus would be involved as housing issues arise (OFA, Energy, etc) The HAG can also be called together to respond to emergency situations (fire, other disasters)

The Steering Committee discussed the need for HAG to have a clear charge from City Council to perform the function of coordination and problem solving so that the City can develop a coordinated approach to housing issues Without clear support from Council the HAG meetings could become perfunctory The Steering Committee discussed a couple of options to ensure accountability and authority 1) HAG as an entity reports to the Commissioner of Housing, or 2) the Commissioner of Housing actually serves as Chair of the HAG These options warrant further discussion

Housing Data Collection

Current System Each bureau collects data relevant to its own programs Here is a summary list of the kind of data collected by bureaus Building permit data (new construction, rehab, demolitions, housing code violations) (BOB), housing needs assessment, both citywide and target area (focus on low-income) (BHCD, BOP), target area demographics or market data (PDC, BOP), direct development and development finance assistance (HAP, PDC, BHCD)

Gaps Each bureau focuses on meeting its particular data needs There is no established clearinghouse for all housing data There is a willingness to share data with other bureaus, but bureaus may not be aware of what is available This can lead to duplication of efforts, increased costs associated with data collection, and a lack of quality control about the data collected One of the gaps identified by the housing policy update is that no one bureau has responsibility for collecting market data outside of target areas on a systematic or regular basis Market data information tends to be fragmented Regional housing market and submarket information is included among the data collection needs

Recommendation #2: Develop and maintain a relevant housing database to track market activity and city housing assistance program performance.

Discussion Because each bureau collects its own data, there is not always consistency of terms (income categories), or geographic areas. The lack of consistency makes it difficult to aggregate data, or to track program performance over time. Bureaus are often asked to provide data outside their area of expertise. This leads to duplication of efforts and inconsistent data. As a result, data does not necessarily help decision-making, or lead to useful performance evaluation.

There is potential for using the GIS analysis to a much greater degree to evaluate housing activities. Again, most bureaus have some type of a GIS function. The City is improving its coordination of GIS overall, a coordinated approach to using housing data with GIS should also be developed. The Stakeholders recommendation on Blueprint 2000 includes a recommendation on technology improvements. The Steering Committee is interested following up with the Blueprint 2000 staff on the technology recommendations.

Coordinated Housing Planning and Program Delivery

- Housing Research & Program Evaluation
 - Strategic Housing Planning (goals, priorities, strategies, resources)
 - Comprehensive (Functional) Housing Budget
 - Resource Development
- Housing Research & Program Evaluation

Current System Each bureau conducts its own research, and often its own program evaluation (either in-house, by graduate students, or by consultants). Under auspices of HCDC the Housing Evaluation Group has done evaluation of specific housing funds. Program evaluation sometimes is done at the instigation of Council members (e.g. tax abatement programs (Mayor Katz), distressed area tax abatement (Commissioner Sten)).

- Gaps* There is no regular or predictable schedule of program evaluation so it tends to be done to respond to perceived problems. Often evaluation is done by implementers rather than by an objective third party. There is no systematic process for

citizens/customers to give feedback on implementation, either to suggest new strategies or critique existing ones

Recommendation #3: Establish a protocol for housing research or program evaluation (e.g. non-implementing bureau or consultant evaluates; each bureau establishes schedule and budget for program evaluation; when new programs are developed and funded, include schedule and method of evaluating program effectiveness).

Discussion Housing research and program evaluation are important functions, but are not always prioritized in the budget process. The first step in terms of Council may be to establish this as a priority. New programs should be supported by a research component, and should also include an evaluation plan, that includes measurable outcomes, and a "sunset or revise" target date.

- Strategic Housing Plan

Current System Each bureau with a housing responsibility develops its own strategic plan for housing, usually on a short-term basis tied with one or two year budget process. BHCD is responsible for annual needs assessment and update of the Consolidated Plan, which guides the prioritization of federal funds. PDC budgets through the 5-Year Plan process. Both the Bureaus of Planning and Buildings propose priorities through the budget process. Other bureaus pursue strategies (e.g. infrastructure and park improvement, transportation system improvements, public safety programs, etc.) that are related to housing. Since City Council has final authority for the city budget, the ultimate list of priorities is established by City Council.

As the Housing Policy update project has demonstrated, members of the citizen boards and commissions have valuable expertise, but are not necessarily familiar with the significant housing issues that other boards face. For example, HCDC's mission is to focus on low-income housing, PDC is focused on neighborhood revitalization (including housing), growth management implementation, and economic development, the Planning Commission is focused on comprehensive land use planning, and community plans (where housing is just one of many concerns), and the Housing Authority

Board is focused on providing housing for the lowest income sector of the population

Gaps There is no short list of short-term housing priorities. As plans are completed, or as problems arise, the list of priorities gets longer rather than more focused. There is no one document that clarifies how housing and housing related strategies are coordinated among city bureaus. Bureaus and citizens get conflicting messages about the City's housing priorities.

The boards and commissions may not know how their recommendations and advice on housing fit in with the advice of other boards and commissions. The commission members themselves have little opportunity for interaction and exchange of ideas and expertise. There is currently citizen oversight, advice and input regarding housing issues, but no way to provide coordinated oversight that covers housing for all income levels.

Recommendation # 4: Develop a biennial Housing Action Plan that identifies short-term priorities, strategies, target areas, and performance goals. (see addendum)

Recommendation #5: Develop a mechanism for citizen advice and oversight of the Housing Action Plan.

Discussion This recommendation draws on the city's past experience when the Office of Housing Policy published two documents: 1) an Annual Housing Management Plan that identified emerging housing issues, performance goals, and strategies, and 2) an Annual Housing Report that reported on accomplishments against the goals, and strategies of the Housing Management Plan.

The Housing Action Plan provides a mechanism to do a number of things the Steering Committee has discussed: 1) provide a regular timeframe during which existing housing strategies are evaluated, 2) provide a coordinated process to identify and evaluate new strategies, and 3) provide a basis for an allocation process for public sector funding that is responsive to changing social and market conditions. Some elements of the proposed Housing Action Plan have already been developed as part of the Housing Policy Update (the Guide to City Housing Programs, and Glossary of Terms)

The Housing Advisory Group would recommend the Housing Action Plan to City Council along with a comprehensive housing budget. City Council could then make explicit its direction to all bureaus by adopting both the Housing Action Plan and budget. One of the components of the Housing Action Plan would be a rolling Top Ten List of Housing Priorities that would provide the focus for implementation.

The Steering Committee discussed the need to ensure citizen oversight and advice on the Housing Action Plan in order to ensure accountability and a process for community involvement in housing issues. The Steering Committee considered a number of alternatives for the citizen oversight mechanism: 1) expanding the charge of an existing board or commission, 2) creating an ad-hoc committee made up of representatives of PDC, HAP, HCDC, and the Planning Commission, and 3) expanding the ad-hoc committee of board and commission reps to include other private sector and neighborhood representatives. The Steering Committee's operating assumption is that the system improvements should build on existing citizen advisory groups rather than create entirely new ones. They also want to build on the interaction between the Boards and Committees that has occurred as a result of the Housing Policy Update project. The Steering Committee is still evaluating these citizen oversight options. Regardless of the makeup of the citizen advisory committee, the Steering Committee believes that one is necessary and that it would provide valuable advice to the City on the prioritization of strategies, as well as on research and evaluation needs. It would also provide a link to market activities to ensure that city programs are coordinated with the marketplace.

- Comprehensive (Functional) Housing Budget (linked to Housing Action Plan)

Current System Each bureau with a housing mission develops an overall departmental budget that includes a budget for housing programs or departments. City bureau budgets are incorporated into the overall city budget. Both HAP and PDC are quasi-public agencies chartered by the City of Portland and as such maintain a separate budget, although both are grantees of locally controlled federal funds.

Gaps The adopted city budget is categorized by department and fund source, rather than by function. It is difficult to get a clear sense of overall city priorities for housing by looking at each bureau's budget. The city budget does not reflect foregone revenue programs (tax abatement, SDC and fee waivers). In addition, some housing priorities could be addressed by non-housing budgets (e.g. infrastructure and transportation, parks, public safety).

Recommendation #6: Prepare a functional housing budget tied to the Housing Action Plan.

Discussion This recommendation is not intended to eliminate the responsibility of each bureau to develop a departmental budget recommendation. The idea is that if bureau managers are working together through the HAG to focus on coordinating a short list of priorities and strategies for Council, their increased coordination will lead to a more coordinated budget. Presenting budget information about housing in a coordinated way (including City of Portland, HAP, and PDC) and linking that budget to a Housing Action Plan, will allow elected officials and the public at large to evaluate the priorities and performance of the housing system. The presentation of information is similar to the "Budgets in Brief" prepared by OFA that reports budget trends by functional area. Currently housing activities are included in a section on Community Livability.

- Resource Development

Current system Individual bureaus, or Commissioners, take the lead in finding and developing new resources. The City's Office of Finance and Administration may or may not be involved in strategy development. Sometimes resource development is tied to the City's legislative agenda. An interagency group has recently convened to discuss coordination of housing resource development strategies. The performance of the private sector in meeting community credit needs is also a current issue that is being addressed by BHCD, PDC, and Commissioner Kafoury's office.

Gaps Within the city, resource development is dependent on individual initiative rather than on an assignment of functional responsibility. Resource development strategies must involve the

private sector, and whether or not it does often depends on who takes the lead – again there is no SOP for who and how to involve the private sector. A CRA study was recently done as a one-time effort, but in order to increase private sector involvement and investment a more sustained effort may be necessary.

Recommendation #7. Identify housing resource development as a top housing priority, tie it to goals identified in the Housing Action Plan, and develop financing strategies (public and private) to further goals.

Discussion This function also relates to the charge to the Livable Cities Housing Council – which was to get private institutions engaged in helping the city develop strategies and tools to “build 50,000 housing units that developers could afford to build and people could afford to live in.” Resource development was an important part of their charge, which must be continued if the city is to achieve its housing growth management and affordable housing goals.

Addendum: Housing Action Plan

Objectives of the Housing Management Plan:

- a to improve management/coordination of housing programs,
- b to provide information to citizens, public agencies, developers, about city housing priorities, programs and strategies,
- c to lay the ground work for monitoring/evaluating the programs by setting goals/identifying system improvements

Outline of Management Plan

- A Current Opportunities and Challenges Paint a picture of the key challenges and opportunities the city faces in regard to housing*
- B City Council Top 10 List of Housing Priorities Within the context of adopted housing policy, Identify City priorities and strategies for the short and long-term Describe assumptions and perceived trade-offs used in making choices*
- C City Housing Action Plan*
 - 1 Adopted housing policy and strategies,*
 - 2 Resource development strategies,*
 - 3 Descriptions of the City's Housing Programs Eligibility, Process, Responsible Agency, Program Objective including a statement how these programs contribute to City Policies and Objectives,*
 - 4 Biennial budgets (cash or foregone cash) for City Housing Programs tied to production, acquisition, or preservation targets by income group, or by geographic area,*
 - 5 Maps of Designated Target Areas with descriptions of program availability,*
 - 6 Other Housing Programs Available (State, Federal, County, Private Sector),*
 - 7 Definition of Terms,*
 - 8 Current Income Guidelines*

RESOLUTION No.

35748

Accept Section III (Policies, Objectives and Strategies) of the Comprehensive Plan Housing Policy Report to City Council from the Planning Commission and accept the Preliminary Recommendations from the Housing Policy Steering Committee on Housing System Improvements (Resolution)

WHEREAS, the Housing Policy Steering Committee, including citizen representatives from the Planning Commission, Portland Development Commission, Housing Authority Board, and the Housing and Community Development Commission, led an interdepartmental effort by the Bureaus of Planning and Housing and Community Development, the Housing Authority of Portland, and the Portland Development Commission to review and update the City's Comprehensive Plan Housing policy,

WHEREAS, the Housing Policy Problem Statement identified the need for a document that summarizes the city's housing policy and links it to city housing strategies,

WHEREAS, additional public comment generated by the Housing Policy Update project identified the need for the city to increase the efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability of the city's housing delivery system,

WHEREAS, the housing policy itself is adopted by ordinance as a part of the Comprehensive Plan, the identified strategies and programs referenced in Section III of the Comprehensive Plan Housing Policy Report and Recommendation to City Council from Planning Commission are not part of the Comprehensive Plan,

WHEREAS, the housing policy is intended to provide guidance over the long term, the Draft Problem Statement identified the need to monitor, evaluate, and periodically update city strategies in response to changing market conditions,

WHEREAS, the identification of strategies and programs, either existing or potential, does not obligate the City to commit funds for their implementation,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has provided to City Council advice on how conflicts within the policies and objectives should be resolved (Exhibit D),

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission advises that in order to implement the housing policy the City needs to maintain an array of tools beyond the traditional tools of zoning and the Comprehensive Plan Map,

WHEREAS, the adopted Housing Policy provides a long-term policy framework for the entire city and for all income levels, the Planning Commission advises that citywide and area specific plans provide the fine-tuning needed to prioritize and apply broad policies and objectives to specific areas and to specific income groups,

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission is a policy body, and as such has a limited role in implementation, it expects implementing agencies to consider the prioritization and application of housing policies and objectives when they develop and implement strategies,

WHEREAS, the Housing and Community Development Commission voted to support the recommended housing policy, and expressed concern about the prioritization of policies to guide decision-making for implementation, and expressed interest in participating in further steps with other community partners to develop and evaluate strategies for implementation,

WHEREAS, the Housing Authority Board voted to support the recommended Housing Policy and, adopted a resolution urging City Council to provide a schedule for consideration of strategies to carryout the Policy, assign administrative responsibility for policy implementation, coordination, and analysis, and develop periodic updates as the market and other factors change,

WHEREAS, the Portland Development Commission adopted a resolution to support the proposed housing policy and as an implementer of city housing policy has participated in the development of existing and potential strategies,

WHEREAS, the City Council will adopt the Recommended Housing Policy as part of the City of Portland Comprehensive Plan,

WHEREAS, the Housing Policy Steering Committee developed preliminary recommendations intended to improve housing policy implementation and resource development, through increased housing system coordination, accountability, and citizen involvement,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that City Council accepts Section III of the Comprehensive Plan Housing Policy Report to City Council as representative of the linkage of housing strategies to housing policies, attached as Exhibit "C" to Ordinance _____,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council accepts the Preliminary Recommendations from the Housing Policy Steering Committee on Housing System Improvements, attached as Exhibit "E" to this resolution

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council authorizes and directs the Housing Policy Steering Committee to finalize its recommendations to City Council to increase the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of the City in implementing, monitoring, and evaluating its housing policy

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council authorizes the Housing Policy Steering Committee to continue its interdepartmental and inter-agency effort to improve housing coordination as follows


- a Expand its membership to include representatives from the Bureau of Buildings, and the Office of Finance and Administration,
- b By March 1, 1999, develop a final recommendation on housing system improvements to City Council that includes a detailed implementation plan and budget,
- c Develop a Housing Action Plan that recommends to City Council 2-year priorities, key strategies, and goals tied to the 1999/2000 budget,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council supports the Mayor's designation of a City Commissioner with functional responsibility for Housing to replace Commissioner Kafoury as Chair of the Housing Policy Steering Committee

Adopted by the Council, **DEC 10 1998**

Commissioner Gretchen Miller
Kafoury
Cathey Briggs, 12/2/98

BARBARA CLARK
Auditor of the City of Portland

By 
Deputy

1799

Agenda No

RESOLUTION NO.

35748

Title

Accept Section III (Policies, Objectives and Strategies) of the Comprehensive Plan Housing Policy Report to City Council from the Planning Commission and accept the Preliminary Recommendations from the Housing Policy Steering Committee on Housing System Improvements (Resolution)

INTRODUCED BY Commissioner Gretchen Miller Kafoury	Filed DEC 03 1998 Barbara Clark Auditor of the City of Portland
NOTED BY COMMISSIONER Affairs <i>Gretchen M. Kafoury</i>	By <u><i>Cay Kershner</i></u> Deputy
Finance and Administration	
Safety	
Utilities	For Meeting of
Works	
BUREAU APPROVAL	
Bureau Planning	
Prepared by C Briggs	Date 12/1/98
Budget Impact Review Completed <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action Taken <input type="checkbox"/> Amended <input type="checkbox"/> Passed to 2nd Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Continued to
Bureau Head <i>Dan Kunder</i> David Knowles, Planning Director	

AGENDA		FOUR-FIFTHS AGENDA	COMMISSIONERS VOTED AS FOLLOWS		
Consent	Regular		YEAS	NAYS	
		Francesconi	Francesconi	✓	
NOTED BY		Hales	Hales	✓	
City Attorney	<i>by Pete Vesting</i>	Kafoury	Kafoury	✓	
City Auditor		Sten	Sten	✓	
City Engineer		Katz	Katz	✓	