



Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**

Date/time: Wednesday, June 26, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual video meeting via Zoom

Members Attending

Eryn Kehe, Chair
Joseph Edge
Carol Chesarek
Victor Saldanha
Tom Armstrong
Erik Olson
Terra Wilcoxson
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich
Steve Koper
Katherine Kelly
Jamie Stasny
Adam Barber
Laura Kelly
Manuel Contreras, Jr.
Gery Keck
Nina Carlson
Tom Bouillion
Bret Marchant
Mary Kyle McCurdy
Nora Apter
Rachel Loftin
Brendon Haggerty

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County Community Member
Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Largest City in the Region: Portland
Largest City in Clackamas County: Lake Oswego
Largest City in Multnomah County: Gresham
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin
City of Vancouver
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Oregon Depart. of Land Conservation & Development
Clackamas Water Environmental Services
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
NW Natural
Port of Portland
Greater Portland, Inc.
1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon Environmental Council
Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Multnomah County Public Health & Urban Forum

Alternate Members Attending

Laura Weigel
Dakota Meyer
Miranda Bateschell
Theresa Cherniak
Oliver Orjiako
Glen Bolen
Kelly Reid
Chris Faulkner
Cassera Phipps
Natasha Garcia
Tom Mills
Jerry Johnson
Jeff Hampton
Kerry Steinmetz
Erin Reome

Affiliate

City of Milwaukie
City of Troutdale
City of Wilsonville
Washington County
Clark County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Dev.
Clean Water Services
Clean Water Services
Portland Public Schools
TriMet
Johnson Economics, LLC
Business Oregon
Fidelity National Title Greater Metropolitan Portland
North Clackamas Parks & Rec. District

Greg Schrock
Ryan Ames
Leah Fisher

Portland State University
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington County
Public Health & Urban Forum, Clackamas County

Guests Attending

Adam Torres
Cody Meyer
Justin Sherrill
KM
Kevin Young

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
ECONorthwest

OR Department of Land Conservation & Development

Metro Staff Attending

Andrea Celentano, Cindy Pederson, Clint Chiavarini, David Tetrick, Dennis Yee, Eryn Kehe, Glen Hamburg, Jake Lovell, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Miriam Hanes, Serah Breakstone, Ted Reid

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.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Chair Kehe reviewed the voting procedure. Once a quorum has been announced with one vote per seat on the panel, votes will be taken on action items. The committee follows Democratic Rules of Order which are not as strict as the Roberts Rules of Order. We focus on making sure everyone gets to participate in discussion. Following a motion and second on the motion, we can discuss further before a vote is taken. Amendments to the motion can be proposed, and either accepted or not as part of the motion. After all discussion and amendments are made a final vote will be taken.

Joseph Edge announced that on Saturday June 29 the Oak Grove Festival happens which was formerly known as the Trolley Trail Festival. It's located at the intersection of Trolley Trail and Oak Grove Blvd.

Natasha Garcia announced that last night at the Portland Public Schools Board meeting, the board decided to move our bond vote from this November to March 2025. You can expect to see that on your ballots if you're in Multnomah County.

Glen Bolen announced a four mile stretch of I-5 road closure over SW 26th Ave this weekend. All lanes of I-5 will be closed from Friday at 9:00 p.m. to Monday at 5:00 p.m. This project will improve the I-5 bridge over SW 26th Avenue in Southwest Portland with a new structure and upgrade SW 26th Avenue with better lighting, bike lanes, and sidewalks. This project is necessary to replace a worn-out bridge structure on I-5, bring it up to current seismic standards, and ensure continued reliability for travelers.
<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/projects/pages/project-details.aspx?project=20486>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none given.

Consideration of MTAC minutes April 17, 2024 meeting

Motion to accept as written minutes from MTAC April 17, 2024 meeting: Joseph Edge
Seconded: Manny Contreras, Jr.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Consideration of MTAC minutes May 15, 2024 meeting

Motion to accept as written minutes from MTAC May 15, 2024 meeting: Tom Mills

Seconded: Nina Carlson

ACTION: Motion passed with two abstentions: Brendon Haggerty and Rachel Loftin.

Proposed Amendments to Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) Title 6

Recommendation to MPAC (action item) (Glen Hamburg, Metro) The presentation gave the overview on the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) amendments required by the state's Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) program for local adoption of boundaries for 2040 Growth Concept Centers. Back in December 2023, Metro staff presented to MTAC on future amendments to UGMFP Title 6, *Centers, Corridors, Station Communities, and Main Streets*, that would be required by new state regulations as part of state's CFEC program. The state mandates that Metro amend Title 6 by the end of 2024 to require that local jurisdictions adopt by the end of 2025 formal boundaries for the regional and town centers that are shown on the 2040 Growth Concept Map and have been planned for urban land uses.

Draft amendments have not changed since presented in December and would:

1. Apply the Title 6 boundary adoption requirement to all 2040 Growth Concept centers that have been planned for urban land uses, including the Central City
2. Identify a timeframe for cities and counties to report their adopted boundaries to Metro in order for Metro to reflect those adopted boundaries on an updated Title 6 Map
3. Make minor, non-substantive amendments to clarify existing provisions, address formatting discrepancies, update citations, and correct typographic errors.

Metro staff are interested in whether MTAC has any feedback on the draft proposed Title 6 amendments and are seeking a recommendation on the amendments to MPAC. MPAC will consider draft Title 6 amendments later this year and make their own recommendation to the Metro Council. Before consideration by the Metro Council at a public hearing, draft amendments to Title 6 will also be shared with cities and counties in Metro and submitted to the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

Comments from the committee:

Joseph Edge had a question about the multi-jurisdictional rule. If a jurisdiction has already adopted boundaries and the boundaries are already set, they've cleared the hurdle, correct? There's no further need for them to take action, correct? Mr. Hamburg agreed. I think we're going to want to check in with all jurisdictions next year and before Feb. 1, 2026, just to make sure that we understand what it is that they consider to have been adopted in making sure that we reflect what they're telling us is the locally adopted boundaries. They don't necessarily need to do anything further in terms of bringing something for example, to their county board or their city council, but they may need to report to us or confirm to us what their adopted boundaries are.

Mr. Edge asked for technical clarification, we have a regional center around the Clackamas Town Center. It goes into the City of Happy Valley boundary on the east side of I-205 and into the City of Milwaukie boundary on the west side of 82nd Avenue. But the Milwaukie part of it is only one or two properties. So technically, wouldn't that fit the bill if only Milwaukie were to adopt that regional center under the text of the amendment. Couldn't Milwaukie be the one jurisdiction to adopt boundaries for that regional center?

Mr. Hamburg noted hypothetically, yes. We don't foresee that situation occurring. I don't anticipate that the City of Milwaukie is going to attempt to adopt boundaries for a regional center in Clackamas that already has one. Also, there is some language in Title 6 consistent with the relevant CFEC rule that says that the adoptive boundaries need to be in the general location of the center as depicted on the 2040 growth concept map, arguably if one jurisdiction were to adopt boundaries for a center that included only one or two properties, that may not be in the realm of just the general location. I don't foresee the situation coming up. We would accept adopted boundaries for the regional center adopted by Clackamas County, and that would mean that of the cities of Milwaukie and Happy Valley don't also need to go about adopting for the same center or some other portion of it connected.

Carol Chesarek asked for clarification that there were text changes in the language, but not changes to the map currently proposed. Mr. Hamburg noted the map that's included in packet is the 2040 growth concept map as it is today. That map identifies what centers there are out there. But in some cases, the pink blobs that are shown are purely conceptual of these locations. Under the CFEC rules and the amendments that we're proposing to Title 6 local jurisdictions we need to adopt, send specific geographies for those areas. And then we're going to update the map that's in your packet after the fact to reflect what they've adopted.

Jerry Johnson noted at some point we should probably revisit referring to this the 2040 Growth Concept. We are 34 years into the 50-year visioning process.

Nina Carlson noted my concern with this whole aspect is have we considered those folks that need jobs, need to be family wage, or living wage jobs. I know the idea of these city centers are to create walkable, bikeable neighborhoods. I'm hoping that there's been some consideration about where we put industrial siting near those city centers or where we have areas for manufacturing other kinds of employment lands around those centers, and that we're being mindful of that because if we're going to create walkable, bikeable communities we're going to need some of those jobs nearby, too.

Mr. Hamburg noted in the centers we foresee employment opportunities in them as well. Another thing is that on the 2040 growth concept map you'll see some sections of the region that are colored blue. These are our Title 4 lands. These are areas that are protected specifically for industrial and other employment land uses. The 2040 growth concept is thinking about both already. There is a long-term vision for the development of these centers but also a long-term vision for the protection of industrial and employment lands in specific areas of the region. Ultimately, the local jurisdictions, the cities and the counties will be the ones defining the boundaries for these areas themselves.

Glen Bolen noted one of the things I'm wondering about is the City of Portland's comp plan, for example, and the work that everyone's doing right now on 82nd Avenue. There are many smaller centers on Portland's comprehensive plan that meet or exceed many of our definitions of what a town center is from a density or mix use thing. Is there any thought to expanding the town center to bring in those kinds of places where jurisdictions have done planning? I'm thinking of 82nd Avenue and Montgomery Ward District as two examples but I'm sure that other cities have them as well. The centers, as per CFEC will also function very similar to Multi-Modal Areas (MMA) in regard to the Transportation Planning Rule.

Mr. Hamburg noted the specific answer to your question is yes, there have been those discussions. What do we do if, for example, a local jurisdiction wants there to be more centers than we necessarily have depicted on the 2040 growth concept map? There's nothing in Metro's program. It's functional

plan, for example, that would necessarily prohibit a city or a county from making those local choices to things the essentially create other centers. We've not really answered that for ourselves yet. I'll let others weigh in if they know of what to do about amending the 2040 growth concept map itself to specifically identify what are for those centers that are already on the 2040 growth concept map that need to have adopted boundaries.

Chair Kehe added the 2040 growth concept was developed in the 1990s. There are internal conversations at Metro about scoping a process to update our regional vision as well as the functional plan and our framework plan. The 2040 growth concept is part of that. I hope that we have a presentation from someone in Metro staff later this year giving some updates about a schedule.

Joseph Edge noted it's not part of this amendment but is this foreshadowing some kind of regulatory requirements for centers? Or are we just seeing these as conceptual and there's really no plan to set particular targets because I realize we're already setting targets for what we expect use mixes and density to be, in terms of the residents and workers in the centers. They're not regulatory, correct? Unless maybe it's required if you want a regional investment or is that not really anticipated.

Mr. Hamburg noted the purpose of adopting these boundaries is to define an area where CFEC regulations are going to apply for jurisdictions in the Metro region. I hesitate to be the spokesperson for what the state rules require of local jurisdictions, but they relate to things like motor vehicle parking, improvements of tree canopy, provision of bicycle parking, that sort of thing. CFEC regulations will apply, requirements will apply within and near these defined geographies and Metro steps in to require that there be these defined geographies. But as of right now Metro is not proposing any additional requirements for what occurs in and near those defined areas. That's all going to be requirements that exist right now in the CFEC rules, and we've not received any direction to start talking to local jurisdictions about additional requirements beyond what the state already requires in those spaces. We're just fulfilling the requirements that there be a defined space for the existing state rules to apply locally.

MOTION to approve staff recommendations of amendments to Title 6 as proposed in Attachment C to MPAC for adoption by the Metro Council.

Motion: Carol Chesarek

Seconded: Joseph Edge

ACTION: Motion was approved unanimously with no abstentions.

10-minute meeting break taken

Urban Growth Boundary discussion: Employment lands demand analysis (Ted Reid, David Tetrick and Dennis Yee, Metro) Ted Reid began the presentation with a review of the project timeline.

Jamie Stasny asked for clarification that the public comment period on the draft Urban Growth Report is not beginning in June. It's going to wait until the UGR is released on July 9, correct? Mr. Reid confirmed the public comment period will not be July 9 through August 4.

The presentation resumed showing results employment lands capacity analysis. Three capacity types, Vacant, Infill and Redevelopment, were shown on maps. Buildable acres, reviewed by local jurisdiction showed a total of just under 6,000 industrial land, and 481 commercial acres.

Tom Armstrong noted if you go back to the redevelopment slide, there's an awful lot of dots in Portland, and that only equals 124 acres. That visually seems off to me. Mr. Reid noted we do a number of small parcels that are comprising this redevelopment supply. You're pointing out that most of our capacity for industrial is vacant and infill lands that modeling has not identified as a lot of free development potential in total. Mr. Armstrong asked will the Urban Growth Report have the proforma. Will we be able to see what the residual land value of these redevelopable sites is. Just to compare it to actual market activity. Mr. Reid noted I think that it may be a question of level of detail or what we publish versus what we can talk to you about.

Clint Chiavarini noted it's a real issue with mapping because what's happening with this redevelopment a lot of these redevelopment parcels, are very small pieces and that there's that probability that gets apportioned for the redevelopment as well. Each of these dots may represent a very small fraction of an acre. It's difficult to show very small magnitudes without the map looking blank. For redevelopment in particular it's hard because the way that the proforma model works the probability and the net acres are very small numbers.

Bret Marchant noted Mr. Reid had specific maps showing infill and the redevelopmentable land. Do you have a similar one showing just the vacant land? This was shown from the presentation. It was suggested if having an appendix detailed maps by acreage, filtering out the small lots to help differentiate this size lots. Mr. Reid added later on in this presentation we will show a map of large industrial sites, 25 plus buildable acres.

Dennis Yee presented information on the employment land demand methodology. Converting jobs to acres was shown in detail:

- Regional (7-county MSA) employment forecast by sector
- Apply historic UGB capture rate by sector
- Deduct shares of work from home/hybrid by sector
- Assign shares of each sector to 6 building types
- Account for current excess office vacancies
- Apply square feet per employee by building type
- Apply floor area ratios by building type
- Acres determined

Manny Contreas asked on that surplus or deficit, when you make your evaluation, if a deficit is going to be a zero or would it be, for example, negative eight? Mr. Yee noted if we're talking about the deficit that just means that presently we're estimating more demand in the 20 year forecast relative to the supply that's been figured out. The deficit just means we're going to have to deal with it in some fashion. Chair Kehe added a negative number demonstrates that there is a need for land in that scenario.

Joseph Edge had a question about the map that showed different kinds of regional groups outside areas. Why are certain portions of land in Clackamas County that are inside the I-205 loop on the east side that are in outer Clackamas versus inner Clackamas? It just seems to be unintuitive with that last map. There are some portions that are west of I-205 adjacent to inner Clackamas and it seems more logical that would be inside the I-205 loop. Could you describe why this decision was made and what the implications would be adjusting this to reflect a more logical inner and outer Clackamas scenario.

Mr. Yee noted part of it is a census tract-based boundary that we're utilizing. Census tracts in Clackamas County tend to be largeish. So either take all of the census tract or none of it, and it creates these funny geographies as you pointed out. Secondly, the geography is based on what we call employment zones that were part of the now defunct land use model, MetroScope. When we were using that model more for analytical purposes that was one of the EA Zones. It is bordered into that outer I-205. If we have a new land use model that we're hoping to stand up in the next year or two and these boundaries are likely to change because the geographies are not as beholden to the large census tracts. This new model is more of a parcel-based approach. It's a hybrid between a parcel-based approach/block based or block group census. We'll have a greater chance of remapping these boundaries and possibly informing this UGB land demand analysis. But for now we're stuck between two of our analytical models.

Glen Bolen referred to a map of the commercial land need and it appeared a couple of ODOT facilities, Highway 99 and Oregon 10 for example, seemed to look very different at the county line. The Washington County side showed a bunch of red dots for commercial development potential. The Portland side of that line showed not dots at all. When I saw that map I assumed that must be because Portland has a mixed use zone rather than a pure commercial zone. I expected to see something fall out of this, the numbers here at the end. Mr. Reid noted my suspicion is that we have county assessor data that are influencing some of the redevelopment potential.

Mr. Bolen noted I was wondering if that was possibly too, if you're using a rate based on one city or county versus another, but it doesn't mesh with the logic. I'm struggling with this one because I fell this is then leading to that deficit that is showing potential commercial space, if Portland's classifications are somehow not showing opportunities that might be there. For consideration - with the "surface" modeling I think one could normalize the assessor data to adjust for high/low assessment based on both the spread within the county data, and via recent sale price per foot.

Clint Chiavarini added there's probably some subtleties in here. There are likely two things going on. One is there's not a lot of purely commercial zoning out there. Particularly in Portland, a lot of it is mixed use. That begs the question why no mixed use is showing up either. That gets into some of the market forces that are driving this proforma model. Mr. Yee agreed that it's mixed use versus commercial and the proforma mixed use cost structures and whatnot are different than the commercial. The other point with across the borderline that goes on with the mixed use is that it tends to be, with the sort of winner take all way that the proforma works, is that those mixed use are going towards residential and not towards commercial. Another point is that mixed use residential with this residential component could go one way or the other.

Tom Armstrong noted that winner take all methodology is probably the flaw here. When we do our local BLI we allocate in our mixed-use areas 20% of the space capacity to commercial because that's what we actually see happen on the ground in actual buildings that get developed. My questions actually had to do with the commercial reconciliation demand supply analysis and showing the deficit for the baseline and the high growth scenarios that in the face of that demand wouldn't you expect the probability in terms of the redevelopment capacity to increase. Will you be reporting some of those gross numbers stuff that is in play before you start slicing it with what's the probability that it will develop in the next 20 years? There's a lot of low value properties that in the face of high demand are going to turn over faster than your forecasting may show. So the capacity, especially on the commercial side, is probably there. It's just not getting captured by your probability rates.

Ted Reid noted we're trying to provide more of that context in our writeup of these numbers. I think the other thing that we could say about this is that we know commercial uses happen on industrial lands, so we would expect that some amount of commercial demand will continue to be met on industrial lands. We've shown we had a surplus on the industrial side. So I think there are a number of contextual pieces that we need to get there along with these numbers.

Mr. Yee noted I think there was a misspeak or a misunderstanding on the mixed use residential supply information or availability. We do have a split rate there and it's by area and I think many of the jurisdictions who reviewed them recall that we did call the question, what's the mixed use residential split rate. Mr. Armstrong used the example of 80/20. We have 5/95, or 10/90, or 50/50. It depends on the area of our mixed use residential. When I think we say all or nothing it's after we've done that split rate. Mr. Chiavarini added that split rate gets applied to the vacant side of things. It gets applied to the vacant land supply. But the MUR side of things is still basically a winner take all proposition for the readout. We could look at ways to correct that.

Greg Schrock had a question to do with the industrial land analysis, and how you account for the heterogeneity of industrial land, both the kind of supply and the demand, both in terms of the size, the characteristics, the location, given especially that industrial land tends to be very peripheral within the urban area. It's different if it's in Washington County versus Airport Way versus Wilsonville. For a perspective industrial user it may make a big difference whether the aggregate supply is all clustered in one end of the region, and the demand is over on another side. How does this overall supply demand picture account for that?

Mr. Reid noted we are tasked with performing a regional analysis of need. In the next slides we're going to talk a little about capacity and demand in aggregate and what the surplus or deficit may be in aggregate. We'll talk about the specific proposal we have from the City of Sherwood for an employment area addition to the urban growth boundary and whether that area has some unique characteristics that are otherwise in short supply.

Mr. Reid noted we did work with a consulting firm to do a quick update of the inventory of large industrial sites. This is 25 plus buildable acres. The consulting firm did this work to support the state semiconductor task force in the last year. We've been doing this inventory since 2011 and updated a few times. Over the years there has been absorption of these large industrial sites. Tier One is likely to be development ready in the next 6 months. Tier Two is likely to be development ready in 7 to 30 months, and the Tier Three likely to take over 30 months to become development ready. The challenge having the land is one question, and then whether appropriate investments and actions have been taken to make that land development ready. Repeatedly over the years as we've done this work, we've seen need for transportation investments, wetland mitigation, site assembly, patient investments in site assembly, those types of things need to happen to make sites development ready.

Steve Koper asked how buildable is defined in this context. The site that is in 12 on the map adjacent to the word Sherwood is likely currently an active rock quarry. I agree that it's Tier Three but am unsure if it's actually buildable as opposed to maybe redevelopable. Curious how those terms are being used. Mr. Reid agreed that is a good point with some of these sites. The development readiness of these is in part actions that need to happen and in part some serious challenges with the sites themselves. Mr. Chiavarini did a little work with what the consulting firm definitions were compared to our and the consulting firm came up with higher acreage that we were in our work, generally.

David Tetrick presented the Sherwood West employment analysis. The project question was on an economic benefit to include employment acres above and beyond the regional growth forecast. The project approach included to market supply and site competitiveness.

Market supply: A diverse regional market supply of sites is essential to maintain an equilibrium in market pricing and to support a broad range of industries.

Site competitiveness: The Sherwood West site has characteristics that are suited to accommodate the industries that are likely to grow, which will support regional economic and business growth.

Tom Armstrong asked if there was anything given in the Title VI designation for Industrial Lands when it comes in. Will it be designated as prime industrial to meet these specific market needs that you've identified? Mr. Reid noted if Metro Council does decide to add this area to their growth boundary, they would apply some conditions of approval which would include presumably some Title 4, that's our industrial employment areas map designation. We have three different designations, the regionally significant industrial area, industrial areas, and employment areas. I think that would be a discussion with our Council about their policy objectives along with potentially adding the site, what do they hope to achieve with it and how would they like to protect it.

Mr. Armstrong asked will it be part of the draft. Will it be part of the COOs recommendation? Will it be part of our discussion impact, or is it all the way in December when this discussion takes place? Mr. Reid noted the COO recommendation will address topics like that and will give some substance for MTAC and other groups to react to and help improve.

Bill Marchant appreciated the additional analysis and this kind of next level analysis. This matches up with what we hear anecdotally from at Greater Portland, Inc. For the rest of you here, anecdotally from staff, the economic development staff we work with across the region, commercial realtors, and even site selectors from across the country are saying similar things. Sometimes we worry about just anecdotal data. This additional analysis you've done really helps to confirm what we're hearing as well. Thank you for that.

Chair Kehe reminded the committee we are getting close to the period where we'll make the recommendation to MPAC in September. The Urban Growth Report will be coming out before your next meeting and will provide a lot of data and information, but conclusions will come later with the COOs recommendation in August. Our meeting in July will show all the pieces along the way and talk about how it all comes together. It's a good opportunity for you to delve into that information. We can use that time to think about what technical information MTAC wants to recommend to MPAC.

2040 Planning and Development Grant program changes (Serah Breakstone, Metro) Serah Breakstone presented information on the 2040 Planning and Development Grants Program Updates. A program overview was provided. Following a program refresh with user survey, stakeholder conversation and input for improvement for effectiveness and streamlining the process to focus on expanded opportunities, ease of use and providing more support, program changes were made.

- Rolling cycle with quarterly awards
- Grants available for Tribes
- Grants available for unincorporated areas for annexation planning
- Simplified grant categories, clear criteria
- Up to 20% of grants can be used for local government staff time

Grant categories have been reduced to two: Concept planning and planning inside the UGB. The program will target \$4 million each year. The general criteria for the 2040 grants were provided. The 2040 grants timeline was given with full applications due September 6. Asked when the next cycle would occur in 2025, Ms. Breakstone noted this was anticipated happening in late February 2025, then near the end of each quarter for the rest of the year.

Kerry Steinmetz asked how much funding normally goes to those that are outside the UGB versus inside. Or does that fluctuate all the time? Ms. Breakstone agreed it fluctuates. When the program first started a lot of the money was funding concept planning work in urban reserve areas. In more recent years the bulk of the money goes to planning work inside the urban growth boundary.

Glen Bolen noted we had a presentation earlier on Title 6 and CFEC, and I'm wondering if your program is getting interest or thinking about how to work with cities as they're doing CFEC related implementation, which is everything from parking to codes. Ms. Breakstone noted we had some interest last year in our 2023 grant cycle. We had maybe just one parking project that was CFEC related that we funded and is now underway. That was for the City of Gresham. I haven't seen anything this year. None of the letters of interest received are in the realm, but those projects are eligible for funding as long as they can meet our criteria.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting June 26, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	6/26/2024	6/26/2024 MTAC Meeting Agenda	062624M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	6/14/2024	MTAC Work Program as of 6/14/2024	062624M-02
3	Draft minutes	4/17/2024	Draft minutes from MTAC April 17, 2024 meeting	062624M-03
4	Draft minutes	5/15/2024	Draft minutes from MTPAC May 15, 2024 meeting	062624M-04
5	Memo	6/14/2024	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Glen Hamburg, Associate Regional Planner RE: Proposed Amendments to UGMFP Title 6	062624M-05
6	Attachment A	N/A	Attachment A: CFEC-Required Amendments to UGMFP Title 6 for Regional and Town Centers	062624M-06
7	Attachment B	N/A	Attachment B: 2040 Growth Concept Map	062624M-07
8	Attachment C	N/A	Attachment C: Draft Proposed Title 6 Amendments	062624M-08
9	Presentation	6/26/2024	Proposed Amendments to UGMFP Title 6	062624M-09
10	Presentation	6/26/2024	Urban growth management: Employment land analyses	062624M-10
11	Presentation	6/26/2024	2040 Planning & Development Grants – Program Updates	062624M-11