



# Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**  
Date/time: Wednesday, September 20, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Place: Virtual video conference call meeting via Zoom

---

## **Members Attending**

Eryn Kehe, Chair  
Joseph Edge  
Carol Chesarek  
Victor Saldanha  
Tom Armstrong  
Dan Dias  
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich  
Anna Slatinsky  
Laura Terway  
Steve Koper  
Katherine Kelly  
Adam Barber  
Jessica Pelz  
Neelam Dorman  
Manuel Contreras, Jr.  
Gery Keck  
Cindy Detchon  
Tom Bouillion  
Tara O'Brien  
Bret Marchant  
Brett Morgan  
Nora Apter  
Preston Korst  
Erik Cole

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County Community Member  
Multnomah County Community Member  
Washington County Community Member  
Largest City in the Region: Portland  
Largest City in Washington County: Hillsboro  
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City  
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton  
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley  
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin  
City of Vancouver  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Clackamas Water Environmental Services  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
North Clackamas School District  
Port of Portland  
TriMet  
Greater Portland, Inc.  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
Oregon Environmental Council  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Schnitzer Properties & Revitalize Portland Coalition

## **Alternate Members Attending**

Kamran Mesbah  
Faun Hosey  
Mary Phillips  
Jean Senechal Biggs  
Martha Fritzie  
Theresa Cherniak  
Kelly Reid  
Cassera Phipps  
Randy Ealy  
Jerry Johnson  
Aaron Golub  
Jacqui Treiger  
Craig Sheahan

## **Affiliate**

Clackamas County Community Member  
Washington County Community Member  
Largest City in Multnomah County: Gresham  
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton  
Clackamas County  
Washington County  
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Dev.  
Clean Water Services  
Portland General Electric  
Johnson Economics, LLC  
Environmental Advocacy Org: Portland State U.  
Oregon Environmental Council  
David Evans & Associates, Inc.

Ryan Ames

Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington Co.

**Guests Attending**

Andy Smith  
Barbara Fryer  
Bruce Coleman  
John Charles  
Ken Rencher  
Kenny Werth  
Maddy Poehlein  
Marc Farrar  
Max Nonnamaker  
Sam Brookham  
Schuyler Warren

**Affiliate**

West Slope Water District  
City of Cornelius  
City of Sherwood  
Cascade Policy Institute  
  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Multnomah County Health Department  
Metropolitan Land Group  
Multnomah County Health Department  
City of Portland  
City of Tigard

**Metro Staff Attending**

Ally Holmqvist, Cindy Pederson, Dennis Yee, Eryn Kehe, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Ted Reid, Thaya Patton, Tom Kloster

**Call to Order, Quorum Declaration and Introductions**

Chair Eryn Kehe called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was declared. Introductions were made. Zoom logistics and meeting features were reviewed for online raised hands, renaming yourself, finding attendees and participants, and chat area for messaging and sharing links. An overview of the agenda was given.

**Comments from the Chair and Committee Members**

- **Updates from committee members around the Region** (all) Kelly Reid announced the DLCD was seeking members interested in serving on the rulemaking advisory committee and technical committee. The link to this application was shared in chat, with the deadline to apply Oct. 2. Encouragement was given to have representation from the Portland area on these committees. Link to apply for membership on the rulemaking advisory committee for the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis: Link to apply for membership on the rulemaking advisory committee for the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis:  
[https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/OHNARACApplication?utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_source=govdelivery](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/OHNARACApplication?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery)
- **Urban Growth Report Stakeholder Roundtable Update** (Chair Kehe) An update was given on the new stakeholder roundtable group that was part of the engagement plan shared with the committee last month. They are being brought together specifically to learn about the Urban Growth Report and provide feedback that becomes part of this report. Better understanding of how data is collected and approach to growth capacity and projections will be shared. There are 22 regionwide members in this group that is scheduled to meet starting next week.

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** none received

### **Consideration of MTAC minutes July 19, 2023 meeting**

Approval of the July 19, 2023 MTAC meeting minutes was given by the committee by majority vote with no corrections.

### **Consideration of MTAC/TPAC August 16, 2023 workshop meeting**

Approval of the August 16, 2023 MTAC/TPAC meeting minutes was given by the committee by majority vote with no corrections. Four abstentions: Neelam Dorman, Mary Phillips, Craig Sheahan, Martha Fritzie.

**Review of Democratic Rules of Order** (Chair Kehe) *Change of order on agenda* Chair Kehe noted the cheat-sheet on this subject in the packet with more information. The presentation included information on the basics with motions for voting following the Democratic Rules of Order. These included making a motion, amending a motion, postponing a motion and voting on a motion.

### **2024 Urban Growth Report: overview of approach to estimating buildable lands and growth capacity**

(Chair Kehe, Ted Reid, Dennis Yee, Metro) The presentation began with the description of capacity in the Urban Growth Report. The Urban Growth Report (UGR) is a decision-making tool for the Metro Council. Capacity is one of the three main components of the analysis in the UGR, along with readiness and demand. The process to determine capacity inside the UGB to accommodate future growth was explained. This is a complex process due to over ½ million parcels in the UGB.

The process to determine capacity begins with categorizing parcels as developed or vacant. Staff uses previous analysis and aerial photos to determine if land inside the growth boundary is “vacant” or “developed”. Removing land from the calculation in 3 categories can include exempt (examples were given), environmental constraints (examples were given), and set aside for future roadways, only on larger vacant parcels and consideration where future roads may be needed.

It was asked when/how are local jurisdictions included early in the process to refine the buildable land assumptions done from the aerial view? Refinements based on things such as power line corridors, environmental, major easements, etc. that aren't always readily seen on an aerial. Chair Kehe noted the preliminary land use inventory would be presented at the LUTAG meeting next week. This will be presented at more MTAC meetings as well. Ted Reid added another option jurisdictions have to review the data is to pick through GIS data. Metro provides the vacant land inventory for review by local planners to adjust as needed.

Joseph Edge asked is it possible to see the generalized zoning definitions and how we map the local governments zoning designations to these generalized zones? Chair Kehe noted this is a crosswalk that shows local zones by types. All 24 cities and three counties in the region have unique zoning codes. Metro categorizes possible zoning into “zone types” to approximate general designations.

The next step in the process is determining capacity. Based on market forces and what could be built, projections are made on if it is likely that someone would choose to develop on a parcel. A graphic of the process was shown leading to determine likelihood of development or redevelopment with the proforma model. The proforma model is also referred to as the Development Supply Processor (DSP), a computer model using development prototypes, it determines development density (units and acres)

based on zoning and what's financially feasible and is used for both developed and vacant land. Elements in the model include adding market feasibility, parcel size and zoning potential to estimated final land capacity.

The proforma assumptions driven by financial feasibility include:

Revenue & returns expected (achievable rents, threshold rate of return)

Expenses expected (construction cost assumptions, operation expenses and vacancy)

Property assumptions (allowed density and parking requirements)

Comments from the committee:

- Dan Dias asked is the Financially Feasible Step also applied to the vacants. This was confirmed.
- Theresa Cherinak asked how does the model account for middle housing? Ted Reid noted middle housing is included in some of the prototypes so they will be candidates in the model as it works through what's feasible. Ms. Cherinak noted it sounds like the model assumes that people are making decisions based purely on financial feasibility. Is there any way to account for the fact that people's decisions are not always rational like that? Chair Kehe noted the financial flexibility is what we can measure, but there is no certainty other factors are added.
- Steve Koper asked how is public utility availability or extension factored in? Chair Kehe noted future public utilities needs would be based on ownership which will be needed from local knowledge. Ted Reid added we typically look at right of way deducing from our buildable land. Serviceability is a different question in that we don't tend to get into the details of utilities when we think of buildable lands.
- Aquilla Hurd-Ravich asked, on the exempt lands, based on ownership, how do utilities fit into that. Semi-public utilities such as PGE and NW Natural, are they factored in somehow? Mr. Reid noted to the extent we know about those from local jurisdictional reviews we would take them out of our buildable inventory. They are not buildable lands for residential and employment purposes.

Chair Kehe added heard from community members that have seen some of these inventories in the past and properties that they know have been listed as developable but knowing the owner has not interest in selling or developing the land. Property owner inclination is unattainable, and we have limited capacity to determine future growth in over ½ million parcels of land. But we can make a good estimation based on the information known.

- Adam Barber asked about landslides in the region. Maps have been produced on these areas in the Metro area in recent years. How are those areas being accommodated in the modeling? Small slides can be engineered around but the large slides cannot. Is that level of risk contemplated in the model? Mr. Reid noted to some extent we catch that when we take out lands that have slopes over 25%, but this is something DLCD has flagged for us as well. We expect to be looking at this more than previously in the past.
- Dan Dias asked for confirmation with the model for jurisdictional access to assumptions to work through the data for accuracy. This was agreed as most helpful. It was noted that many cities work in 20-year planning cycles at local levels with comprehensive plans. With this new approach, will there be a way to flex components as to what land historically Metro has put

into categories of development to access the capacity to yield new development or not. Are these factors in the models, and if so, how?

Dennis Yee noted to some extent the Johnson VSP model does attempt to factor in how much growth did happen on vacant land. Some 6 or 10 years back we had a land development monitoring system that hasn't gotten a lot of air time at MTAC and other groups. But we have been using it to monitor single family, multi-family and commercial/industrial development activity. We hope to use that data in conjunction with ARLS to identify how much new development has occurred over this historical period.

Financial feasibility on vacant land is a much trickier question. We are using financial feasibility to identify what single family zoning can actually develop from a financial standpoint in the middle housing. This is why we are going through this approach. We don't have a lot of data on historical middle housing but can look at this from a feasibility standpoint to help us identify how much of the vacant land is redeveloped/developed.

- Preston Korst asked will environmental mitigation strategies (costs) be included in pro-forma calculations and how that will determine whether or not a lot will get developed? Mr. Lee noted the calculations can be as complex as you want them to be. As noted earlier this is a regional scale analysis for a range approach of data. Mr. Reid added the environmental constraints and how we deduct those before the proforma modeling are taken into account.

Mr. Korst noted perhaps there's a way to capture generalities in cost to address environmental mitigation strategies. Also, are things like tree removal fees that many cities charge being included in pro forma? Many vacant and re-developable lands would no longer be financially feasible for middle housing (especially affordable development).

- Kamran Mesbah noted it appears some of the environmental constraints land is allowed to be developed with mitigations in some cases. Concern was given with changes of extreme weather. Looking at a 20-year planning direction it was asked if we are including these factors into the formula the idea we are going to allow some shrinking of flood plain areas. Flood plain elevations haven't been updated in some cases for decades. It appears we are depending on the municipalities to give this information locally, but there could be an incentive to minimize those exempt areas for more accurate planning.
- Laura Terway noted a lot of jurisdictions have a done deep dive into this work. It was felt the date of adoption coming before local plans are being completed causes concern with using data in current local plans used in the regional model. Mr. Reid noted each city and county is on their own schedule for doing this work. We need a consistent methodology to use. Otherwise it's hard to follow why some properties are counted in areas while others are not.
- Sam Brookham asked will there be any adjustments or right-sizing of the "allowed density" to account for situations where developers might be building at lower densities than the maximum allowed by the zoning? Are brownfields included in the environmental (or other) constraints? Mr. Reid noted to the extent we know about brownfields we account for them. This is an area where we rely on local review.
- Dan Dias asked can you share how timing of potential development also factors into the analysis and model? This seems particularly important for the infill/redevelopment portion and

with greater emphasis of housing production affecting this work. Mr. Reid noted regarding timing of infill and redevelopment, we're looking at a 20-year time horizon. Jerry and Dennis can say more about how that may influence some of the model assumptions. Also, how is Metro accounting for CFEC and its influence on assessing developable lands and capacities?

Mr. Dias noted my timing question was twofold. One looking at the time horizon, which makes sense to be 20 years given our planning approaches. The second portion was how is the timing of realized development/redevelopment/infill being factored into the proforma analysis if at all. For example if we are determining that sites are developable and evaluating financial feasibility that is great, but what happens if many of them are not redeveloping or proving to be financially/market feasible until the latter half or quarter of the planning horizon and how does this mesh with the need for the region and local jurisdictions, and the development community, to be bringing constant and steady supply online to meet regional and sub-regional demand and the additional goals of the state and region?

Jerry Johnson noted the model doesn't specifically output capacity by size range, but it could be modified to do that. The DSP model looks at likelihood of redevelopment and anticipated form of development but is not a demand model. The demand model would be the area in which a differentiation of demand by site size and characteristics could be introduced.

Theresa Cherniak noted the biggest likely immediate impact from CFEC will be that many jurisdictions are eliminating parking requirements. That will affect development feasibility. Mr. Reid added I believe those parking requirements (or lack thereof) get reflected in the development prototypes. Jerry can confirm.

Jerry Johnson noted it will be interesting to assess the impact of reducing parking requirements. Based on previous analyses we have done, the ability to zero park apartments has a significant impact on viability. At the same time we have seen a shift on marginal development to provide parking in jurisdictions without parking requirements. This reflects a tenant and/or lender preference for parking.

Dan Dias noted he was happy to elaborate more as the work progresses. I ask initially because I didn't hear it mentioned in the presentation so just a general question. Also, CFEC does eliminate parking requirements, also limits certain safety and capacity improvements which may have ramifications for densification on existing systems and infrastructure, and thirdly, how will be increase additional modes and transit into new areas where infill/redevelopment and higher densities are being added and perhaps needing/warranting additional transit service.

- Aquilla Hurd-Ravich asked is there a timeline/schedule for the Urban Growth Report? Mr. Reid noted timeline info is here: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/2024-growth-management-decision>
- Bret Marchant asked will the UGR identify developable industrial land by acreage ranges? And how does the demand/supply model account for that? We hear about the shortage of those

middle and larger parcel sizes in the region. Mr. Reid noted we will include commercial and industrial lands in our modeling. We'll include some summary data on the lot size distribution.

**2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Draft Public Comment Report and Recommended Changes**

(Kim Ellis, Metro) Presented was an overview of decision process, comments and major themes, feedback on draft staff recommendations on consent items, and feedback on preview of draft staff recommendations on key policy topics. RTP Ordinance No. 23-1496 was described with **Exhibit A** – 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (and appendices), **Exhibit B** – Regional Framework Plan Amendments, **Exhibit C** – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes, and **Exhibit D** – Findings of compliance. At the MTAC Oct. 18 meeting the committee will also be asked to approve the High-Capacity Transit Strategy Resolution No. 23-5348 with **Exhibit A** – 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy, and **Exhibit B** – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes.

Major themes heard from the final comment period included to invest more in transit, walking and biking, better address safety and climate, accountability to ensure policies are implemented and that priorities align with policies, and project-specific feedback. It was noted Metro staff is summarizing and drafting recommendations to respond to comments in two buckets:

- Key policy topics to address – focus of final discussions
- Consent items – less substantive actions to be considered for approval by Consent

Details covered in the presentation included key policy topics to address in this RTP cycle and beyond.

Policy Topic 1: Investment emphasis – project mix and timing

Policy Topic 2: Pricing policy application to toll projects

Policy Topic 3: Increasing funding for transportation investments

Policy Topic 4: Climate tools and analysis

Policy Topic 5: Mobility policy implementation

MTAC is asked for feedback on draft recommendations on consent items. These recommendations will come back to the committee as Exhibit C in October to act on as a package by Consent, without discussion. Questions or feedback on policy topics/discussion items will be asked as recommendations for each topic in October to discuss and make a recommendation on individually.

Comments from the committee:

- Carol Chesarek asked is there would be time before the 1<sup>st</sup> reading at Metro Council to cover the to-do list that remains. Ms. Ellis noted we won't have all the staff recommendations completed by the 1<sup>st</sup> reading at Council. Upcoming materials to MTAC and TPAC will include more recommendations to consider at meetings. It was acknowledged that information would be provided multiple times prior to meetings to consider.

It was noted there are safety concerns about transit riding with TriMet systems, but no project in the RTP addressing this. Ms. Ellis noted Metro is working with TriMet, and some of the RTP projects address safety issues indirectly. Tara O'Brien noted TriMet did break out operations funding into some additional buckets that highlight some of the safety and security issues. These show up in their project list and have been significantly increasing funded to support



safety issues. They have formed partnerships with others on concerns and more information has been shared on actions taken for commitment with these issues.

- Neelam Dorman agreed on the need to have materials received quickly. It was asked how the voting process was planned regarding consent items and discussion items. Ms. Ellis described how the consent items are taken first. Then discussion items are worked through individually. Then the overall recommendation to adopt the ordinance. The same process applies to the High Capacity Transit Strategy resolution. If changes are suggested to any of the motions this was encouraged to be drafted ahead of the meeting when action is taken. Staff reports provided to MPAC and JPACT on these actions will be provided for their consideration.
- Jessica Pelz asked about the JPACT work plan around regional funding discussions. Ms. Ellis noted JPACT is still working through their annual work plan, defining agendas and forming possible subcommittees. A possible regional funding subcommittee could have more than just elected with a broader base of community involvement. More will be known as the plan is developed.
- Nora Apter asked about specific project investment emphasis category related to project list and timing. It was heard some changes may be made around comments from large projects such as freeway expansions. Information was asked on potential amendments related to these changes responding to the feedback. Was it possible to know in advance what proposed changes will be discussed. Ms. Ellis noted we need to stay within the financially constrained project list based on the RTP forecast. Changes in the strategic project list would require adjustments with possible changes in the constrained list. Larger projects in the RTP are ODOT recommended based on the forecast and their work underway with NEPA, with financial forecast based partly on tolling impacts.
- Jean Senechal Biggs was glad to see the investment emphasis included. RTP outcomes and ability to reach our climate goals will depend on ODOT implementation of pricing and how that plays out. Jurisdictions and cities struggle to move the needle without updating our TSPs to reach these goals. Work with the project lists now is a good starting point for policy for the next RTP. It was noted the Mobility Policy was important and support given for taking the next steps with work needed to be done together.
- Neelam Dorman asked if MTAC could attend the TPAC Oct. 11 workshop with more discussion on RTP and HCT Strategy on the agenda. Tom Kloster noted this was possible and an invitation to MTAC members and alternate members would be extended to attend the workshop.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:24 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder



Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting September 20, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	9/20/2023	9/20/2023 MTAC Meeting Agenda	092023M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	9/13/2023	MTAC Work Program as of 9/13/2023	092023M-02
3	Handout	N/A	Urban growth management committees	092023M-03
4	Minutes	July 19, 2023	Minutes from MTAC July 19, 2023 meeting	092023M-04
5	Minutes	8/16/2023	Minutes from MTAC/TPAC August 16, 2023 workshop meeting	092023M-05
6	Handout	N/A	Democratic Rules Cheat-Sheet: Making Decisions	092023M-06
7	Memo	9/13/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager Ally Holmqvist, HCT Strategy Project Manager RE: Draft Legislation and Next Steps for Finalizing the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2023 High Capacity Transit (HCT) Strategy for Adoption	092023M-07
8	Memo	9/13/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan: Draft Public Comment Report and Overview of Key Concerns Raised for Further Policy Discussion	092023M-08
9	Attachment 1	8/29/2023	Key Dates for Finalizing the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan and 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy for Adoption	092023M-09
10	Attachment 2	September 2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan <i>Working draft</i> Public comment report	092023M-10
11	Attachment 3	N/A	Proposed Discussion Topics on Key Concerns with 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	092023M-11
12	Memo	9/13/2023	TO: MTAC/TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 RTP Comment Log: Summary Comments Received and Draft Metro Staff Recommended Actions – Subject to Refinement	092023M-12
13	Presentation	9/20/2023	Land capacity for growth	092023M-13
14	Presentation	9/20/2023	Decision Making Refresh	092023M-14

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
15	Presentation	9/20/2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Shaping MTAC's Recommendation to MPAC	092023M-15