



Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**
Date/time: Wednesday, September 18, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: In-person and virtual meeting via Zoom

Members Attending

Eryn Kehe, Chair
Joseph Edge
Carol Chesarek
Victor Saldanha
Tom Armstrong
Terra Wilcoxson
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich
Anna Slatinsky
Laura Terway
Katherine Kelly
Jamie Stasny
Jessica Pelz
Laura Kelly
Manuel Contreras, Jr.
Natasha Garcia
Bret Marchant
Mary Kyle McCurdy
Nora Apter
Rachel Loftin
Preston Korst
Brian Moore
Erik Cole
Mike O'Brien
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 Multnomah County: Gresham
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley
City of Vancouver
Clackamas County
Washington County
Oregon Depart. of Land Conservation & Development
Clackamas Water Environmental Services
Portland Public Schools
Greater Portland, Inc.
1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon Environmental Council
Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Prosper Portland
Schnitzer Properties, Inc.
Mayer/Reed, Inc.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah County

Alternate Members Attending

Vee Paykar
Faun Hosey
Patricia Diefenderfer
Ashley Miller
Dan Rutzick
Dakota Meyer
Martha Fritzie
Kevin Cook
Theresa Cherniak
Glen Bolen
Kelly Reid
Cassera Phipps
Fiona Lyon

Affiliate

Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
City of Portland
City of Gresham
City of Hillsboro
City of Troutdale
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Dev.
Clean Water Services
TriMet

Jerry Johnson
Jacqui Treiger
Erin Reome
Greg Schrock
Craig Sheahan
Max Nonnamaker
Leah Fisher

Johnson Economics, LLC
Oregon Environmental Council
Redevelopment/Urban Design, N. Clackamas P&R
Commercial/Industrial, PSU
David Evans & Associates, Inc.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah County
Public Health & Urban Forum, Clackamas County

Guests Attending

Adam Torres
Bruce Coleman
Eric Rutledge
Erika Fitzgerald
Harrison Husting
John Charles
Kelly Ritz
Kevin Young
Kristopher Fortin Grijalva
Marc Farrar
Schuyler Warren

Affiliate

Clackamas County
City of Sherwood
City of Sherwood
City of Gresham
Clark County
Cascade Policy Institute
Stone Bridge Homes NW, LLC
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Oregon Environmental Council
Metropolitan Land Group, LLC
City of Tigard

Metro Staff Attending

Cindy Pederson, Eryn Kehe, Jaye Cromwell, Jessica Martin, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Miriam Hanes, Summer Blackhorse, Ted Reid, Tracey Lam

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. Logistics with in-person meetings and virtual were reviewed.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Review of Democratic Rules of Order for Decision Making (Chair Kehe) The Democratic Rules of Order were noted in the meeting packet to provide guidance on the voting process.

Future Vision – looking for recent visioning efforts in your community (Chair Kehe) Metro staff plans to bring information about the Future Vision update process soon, looking at the 2040 growth plan, maps, scoping and updates. In the interim, staff is looking at recent visioning processes that may have been conducted in your cities and organizations that begin to help understand what some of the values are in your community that you work with. If you have a recent visioning process that you think could be valuable for our staff to collect into our inventory to review as we begin this process for the region, we'd be interested in hearing about what those are. That's both public and private organizations in the recent last five years. These can be sent to Chair Kehe. The Future Vision staff will come to an upcoming MTAC meeting to provide more information.

MetroMap lunch and learn on September 26 (Chair Kehe) A reminder was given on a MetroMap Lunch and Learn session on September 26. If you didn't get that information and you're curious about learning more about Metro's MetroMap with great information available and how to access, reach out to Chair Kehe or Marie Miller for information.

Comments from committee members

Jamie Stasny announced that Clackamas County has a current visioning process going on called the Sunrise Community Visioning Process. It's on Highway 212 heading toward Happy Valley. Many of you travel through there or maybe live in the area. We have an open house coming up September 24 at Adrian Nelson High School. We'd love to have you come out and tell us what you think about the draft scenarios that we've created. We're working to wrap that up early next year. You can reach out to Ms. Stasny for more information.

Brian Moore gave a shout out to the City of Portland being awarded a WNBA team!

Glen Bolen reminded the committee the Joint Committee on Transportation has been doing listening sessions around the state. There are two more to come. Happy Valley is on the 26th and Hillsboro on the 27th.

Natasha Garcia announced the Design Advisory Groups for Cleveland and Ida B. Wells High School are active. The committee is invited to come and see what is happening.

Laura Kelly noted at a meeting this summer MTAC hosted a team led by the Oregon Department of Administrative Services and Oregon Housing Community Services. They provided an update on the work they're doing to create a draft interim methodology for the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis for OHNA and a sub methodology that's specific to the cities and counties in Metro. The legislature directed that the final methodology will be published January 1. DAS and OHCS have now released the draft. It's available on the DLCD website. You can find it under the Sept. 26-27 DLCD meetings. If this is of interest, there are several ways to provide comment. There is an opportunity for verbal comments to DLCD at their meeting on Sept. 27. You can also provide written comments by October 4. The website materials have information about how to submit those and you can also provide public testimony to the Housing Stability Council on the same day, October 4.

Kevin Cook announced that Multnomah County has a new Planning Director, Megan Gibb. Metro folks will be familiar with the name. We're very happy to have her on board.

Public Communications on Agenda Items Eric Rutledge from the City of Sherwood provided testimony on Urban Growth Management Decision: MTAC Recommendation to MPAC. A letter was also sent to the committee prior to the meeting and added to the meeting packet, pg. 44).

Kelly Ritz from Stone Bridge Homes NW, LLC provided testimony on Urban Growth Management Decision: MTAC Recommendation to MPAC (via phone).

Jeff Roberts from Crandall Group provided testimony on Urban Growth Management Decision: MTAC Recommendation to MPAC (written, sent via email and added to meeting packet, pg. 46)

Consideration of MTAC minutes August 28, 2024 meeting

Chair Kehe moved to accept as written minutes from MTAC August 28, 2024 meeting.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objections, two abstentions; Carole Chesarek and Brian Moore.

Urban Growth Management Decision: MTAC Recommendation to MPAC (Ted Reid, Laura Combs, Metro) Ted Reid began the presentation with a review of where we were in the timeline of the recommendation process. Today's vote is to provide recommendation to MPAC to expand the UGB to include the Sherwood West urban reserve and discuss list of thoughts to share with MPAC on the topic areas for potential conditions of approval.

Conditions of approval that were recommended as topic areas include:

- Minimum number of housing units
- Housing affordability
- Protections for large industrial sites to grow the region's high-tech manufacturing sector
- Broad based community engagement
- Tribal consultation

Additional recommendations for Metro work to include:

- Revise how we accounted for slopes on employment lands. DLCD advised Metro to use a 10% slope threshold when inventorying buildable employment lands.
- Update the region's vision for its future which are needed for Future Vision and the 2040 Growth Concept update.
- Improve how we assess equity in growth management decisions. Possible amendments to Title 11 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan to require local governments to complete equity assessments when concept planning for new urban areas.
- Consult with Tribes to identify possible requirements for local governments to consult with Tribes when concept planning and comprehensive planning new urban areas, and identify opportunities to ensure and improve Metro's Urban Growth Report technical analyses are inclusive of relevant tribal priorities, expertise, and data sets.

Comments since the last MTAC meeting have included Sherwood West conditions:

- General feedback
 - Concerns about prescriptive conditions vs. flexibility
 - Need to support local political leadership
 - Past conditions on expansion areas have resulted in better outcomes
- Industrial land
 - Agreement with conditions about some protections for large sites
- Amount of housing
 - Important to facilitate development of housing
 - Identify a minimum number of housing units but allow for Sherwood to meet the requirement with flexibility
 - Proposed minimum density of 6.3 du/na is lower than past expansion areas – concern about sliding backwards, impacts to providing transit in the area
 - Open space needed to support higher densities
 - Want efficient land use to create livable, walkable community
- Housing affordability
 - Regional need for housing affordable to households making 120% of AMI or below - we need housing requirements that support market-provided moderate-income housing
 - Avoid prescriptive requirements – cities don't have their own resources to build affordable housing

– Cities are a critical partner to build affordable housing in their community – their support and leadership is necessary to acquire State funding and tax credits

Metro added the additional recommendations:

- Revise slope threshold for buildable employment land from 10% to 7%
- Consider additional housing demand scenarios beyond the three presented in the UGR

Chair Kehe suggested separating the two questions. Have the committee take a vote on the first question of the COO recommendation to expand the Urban Growth Boundary to the Sherwood West Reserve. This could be motioned, seconded and discussed. Then move to thoughts about conditions. I recognize these things are related and understand that they might overlap in discussion. But I think it's important that we do the vote and have that conversation and then have more time to discuss those potential conditions. We want your feedback on what's been summarized to-date with your technical advice and send to MPAC a list MPAC should think about with those conditions. We don't have to vote on the list but give feedback to MPAC on them.

Comments from the committee:

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich noted I understand that you want to break the vote into two. That make sense to me. But I thought the second question was about the conditions. I'm not sure if you're asking us to vote on conditions or just give feedback on what we think about them. Chair Kehe noted we are looking for feedback about what you think of those condition categories. MPAC is going to make a recommendation to Metro Council about those categories and we're looking for you to provide technical expertise to help inform MPAC's decision. So not asking for a vote but asking for a comprehensive list of your technical advice for MPAC. We've started that list. It's what Mr. Reid presented. It was confirmed we'll take a vote on what we think about the Sherwood West Concept Plan and then secondly, provide feedback on the conditions.

Carol Chesarek asked if we don't feel that the current proposal is something we can vote for without conditions did you want us to just vote against it? Chair Kehe noted you can put up an amendment. Our Democratic Rules of Order allow any member to put up an amendment. You're welcome to do that. Ms. Chesarek noted understanding that they are connected. But was just trying to understand how the split with the conditions works.

Chair Kehe noted I think that what will benefit impact the most will be to have your technical expertise and information about these conditions, because we're not bringing before you specific language of conditions. Instead, their categories and those that language will be decided and ratified by Metro Council. What the Council needs is feedback of and direction on the creation of that language. They're looking for recommendations about categories from MPAC. But from MTAC they need to know all of the dynamics that are going to be important about these conditions so that they can make an informed decision. That's where your technical expertise as MTAC is the most helpful. If you cannot vote one way or the other without a condition, they you as a member can bring an amendment before the committee and see if there's enough votes for that amendment to pass.

Fiona Lyon asked will there be any discussion today about integrating other ideas for future UGB cycles? Chair Kehe noted that would be great. I think that falls under the conditions because frankly, we've talked about both conditions for Sherwood and the conditions for Metro and most of those Metro ones. Apart from moving forward with the Future Vision is about how we do this differently in the future. We absolutely welcome those kinds of conditions in that discussion.

Joseph Edge noted one of the things that we've talked about, and I've certainly brought it up several times over the course of the last year when we've had Sherwood representatives come visit on this topic, is the topic of annexation of these lands after they're added to the growth boundary. My understanding, based on all of this so far is that there's not procedural rule requirement, no legal requirement, no statutory requirement that these lands brought into the urban growth boundary as part of this process are annexed into the city before they're urbanized. My understanding is that the city has to concept plan for the lands that are proposed to be brought into the urban growth boundary. My understand is that annexation is not a requirement that technically, procedurally someone could urbanize land and it would be county land and not be contributing to the tax base of the city. Although likely they would have to abide by the concept plan that as approved for the area. Am I correct, because I didn't see the word annex or annexation anywhere in the staff report that was provided to us today. Is annexation completely not touched as a topic in this?

Ted Reid noted I might lean on some of my city colleagues here to describe your local process, but my general understand is that an urban growth boundary expansion is really a first step in getting towards urbanization and that typically a city is going to go through a comprehensive planning process and in subsequent years there can be annexations of lands. Different cities handle that differently. The timing of when they apply zoning designations to those lands.

Anna Slatinsky noted I'm happy to share Beaverton's view of tis topic. The first thing I want to say is that annexation methods are prescribed by state law. Any annexation process needs to be consistent with state law, which only identifies particular methods by which annexation to cities can occur. It would not probably be possible for Metro to do something other than what state law allows. Most of those methods require the consent of property owners. As you can imagine, there's a wide variety of approaches that cities can take in planning for annexation of areas that have been added to the urban growth boundary.

The other thing I will say is that the areas that are added to the urban growth boundary before they are annexed to cities remain under the jurisdiction of whatever county they're located in. At least in Washington County there is zoning in place that is essentially recognizing that there will be future urbanization under the city regulations. So, it basically locks in a rural zoning allowance that does not allow for urban scale and density development. Under that interim zoning the type of development that this Sherwood proposal describes could not be done until the city annexes and applies those regulations.

I don't believe that's something that is in state law but I don't know the exact ORS references so I would defer to DLCDC folks if you want those specific references. For Beaverton's work on urban growth boundary expansions the folks who are anxious to develop have to wait. They can't develop under this urbanization plan until they annex to the city folks that don't want to annex. Beaverton is constrained in its options for annexing property without the consent of a property owner.

Chair Kehe noted this is a complicated topic that we could talk about in detail, but the most important thing for ow is that it is typical for the urban growth boundary decision to be made and then a comprehensive planning or community planning, depending on how they talk about that planning to occur before annexation begins.

Another approach we could take is taking the two questions in the opposite order and talk about conditions first before calling the for the vote. The committee agreed to this approach.

Mike O'Brien noted, as I understand the range of units per acre is 6.3 to 9.2 for the Sherwood West expansion, is that correct? Eric Rutledge noted that's the zoned density range in the concept plan. It's a concept plan. It does not mean that's that the zoning will turn out to be but at the conceptual level, and to give you the background on that those zones were based off our current zoning. We took the current zoning, applied it to the Sherwood West, took the acres of land within each of those zones, and that's where the range came from.

Mr. O'Brien noted just in rough math 6.3 units an acre is just over 6,900 square feet per unit, which is in my view astonishingly large. I like this condition of going from that 9.2 to 16.4. I think as a region we need housing and if we're not going to commit to providing as much housing as we can on specific areas, we can have an impact. Otherwise, I think we're failing.

Anna Slatinsky asked a follow up question. I think you said based on rough math the size of the unit would be 6,900 square feet. How did you base that on the lot size? Mr. O'Brien noted it's not lot size, because it doesn't take into account infrastructure and right of way. Ms. Slatinsky agreed. That's not a figure that nets out streets, parks, et cetera. I don't know if that's a very helpful metric for context. In Beaverton we're in the home stretch of completing our community planning for the Cooper Mt. area. We ended up exceeding the target that Metro set as a minimum housing goal because our council wanted to produce more housing by a significant amount. Again, for reference, our net densities average out about 12 units per acre, and that includes significant amount of high-density multifamily areas in addition to lots of middle housing. I'm not saying that I think that's what Sherwood should do but just as a point of reference. I don't know what those figures are for the other cities that had urban growth boundary expansions approved in 2018, but that's Beaverton's data point.

Chair Kehe asked were you just clarifying Mr. O'Brien's comments, or did you want something written down related to a condition of housing amount? Ms. Slatinsky noted I think your estimate was really more of a preamble to your comment, but if you're going to start doing math it's important that you know what those numbers apply to. Those calculation, by not including streets and infrastructure and parks and open space and natural areas, you're going to be a little off.

Mr. O'Brien added to that I understand there are other things that go into square footages. But it would be interesting to understand what the kind of net acreage per or net square footage per unit is in each of these. When you factor in all of the other things that need to be there, it would be helpful to understand what amount of land we are committing to for each person in these scenarios. Chair Kehe noted what we've recorded is that you believe that we do need higher densities to support the regional housing need and we've said between 9.2 to 16 units. That's just the number that somebody put in here as a potential. Again, we don't have to agree on these. Everybody has an opportunity to put their thoughts and ideas on the board.

Mary Kyle McCurdy noted, staying on the housing topic, we don't feel that even the COO's recommendation of 9.2 to 16.4 units per acre is sufficient to address the region in Sherwood's needs for middle income and lower income housing. I think the example that Ms. Slatinsky just gave about the 2018 UGB expansions are actually hitting higher numbers that would be were the conditions indicates that the market is ready to accept higher densities than what's being proposed, certainly by Sherwood or in the COO report. And we need higher densities.

The state of Oregon just came out with its draft ONA methodology allocations for every city in the state. It indicates that the region and Sherwood over the next 20 years, that about two thirds of the

housing needs are for those at 120% and under area meeting income. Most of that is for those at 80% and under area meeting income at the units proposed by Sherwood or by the COO. We're not going to meet those needs. Sherwood already has one of the most expensive housing markets in the region.

As I mentioned in our last meeting a rule of thumb for qualifying for state or federal or really any affordable housing is allowing for more density. And that doesn't guarantee you're going to have affordable housing, but you have to set the table to make it possible. These densities don't do that. They also don't support transit. Even at the high end of the COO's report, 16.4 units per acre is not going to support transit. I don't see in the COO's recommendation an analysis of how this translates to climate, which is one Metro's desired outcomes. You don't need to wait until the next visioning process to address climate. That's already in Metro's requirements.

The last thing that I don't see analyzed either is a comparison of the infrastructure cost per unit with this proposal at any of these densities versus redevelopment inside the urban growth boundary. For example, Lloyd Center is proposing 5,000 housing units. What the infrastructure cost comparison? We have significant redevelopment proposals going on in Rockwood, Broadway Corridor and other places around the region that I don't see compared here. Those are concept plans but many not a UGB expansion concept plan, but I don't see that infrastructure cost comparison. And those are all areas that have transit service. I just don't see how the housing needs of the region are met through this proposal.

Laura Terway noted it's clear we're in a housing crisis. We all agree we need more housing; we need more affordable housing. I think with a question for the Metro Council ultimately is how much of that should Sherwood West area shoulder. Also, there are legal requirements for how much densities jurisdictions have to have, and presumably this plan meets those densities that are in place and went through multiple years of public input to come up with a plan at a local level. I want to be very cognizant about that process and honor it.

In some ways it feels like if you change the density at this time in point significantly, it is not helpful to the process or local jurisdictions who had a requirement to meet and now have to meet a different requirement that may change the character of the planning area, potentially significantly. It depends but it's hard for local jurisdictions to come up with a plan and takes a long time. Changing the goal post at the end of the process may not be great to encourage other jurisdictions to continue to produce these concept plans. I think we talked about that a little bit last time as well. But I want to acknowledge that there are density requirements in place and they're not all the same in the Metro area. We heard a lot about concerns for a lower density in certain cities, and that is just what the requirements are. They're a little bit different. They're not the same across the board.

Preston Korst agreed with Ms. Terway's comments. Metro requires cities to lead the process in getting urban growth boundaries started. They require concept planning and thoughtful engagement with the cities and with our constituents. I will note that Sherwood is the only one to apply and they are taking a serious political risk in doing this. I think adding external or unrealistic goals and assumptions in their planning process at the tail end only increases the risk. We're seeing the conversation about land use and growth hampering city's thoughtful planning in King City and North Plains. So, I think the more that we add conditions and the more that we try to write the City of Sherwood's plan for them after they have already written it does nothing more than just add undue risk. And ultimately will kill any development and growth from happening in the first place.

I also think that we should be mindful of the fact that the more we regulate the city's density requirements the more likely it will prevent other cities from doing what they think is right for them. I think Metro's initial approach to getting expansions considered makes a lot of sense. Having cities lead, having cities do the work makes a lot of sense. I think it is pointless if we go in and rewrite it for them. We ask them to do all this work and then we tell them basically that it's not good enough. Even though, to Mr. Rutledge's point and the city's credit, almost 50% are considered housing in this plan to be middle housing.

One thing I wanted to note that I don't think is being considered in a lot of these things when we talk about density is the more we require density the more likely it is we'll see multi-family apartments, assuming a lot of that density requirement, which means the fewer opportunities we'll have for wealth generation and opportunity to build wealth and own one's home. Because the vast majority of housing or vast majority of home ownership in our region is through single family detached housing or through middle housing. Adding on density requirements that are not considered by the city or that to be appropriate for them and for their community only reduces the likelihood of any housing getting built or any home ownership opportunities from happening. Lastly, I want to appreciate the City of Sherwood.

Rachel Loftin noted home ownership and equity is a really important concept that we talk a lot about but have not been incredibly successful at in recent years because there is such a significant divide between what people can afford and what it costs to build new housing at this point in time. If we want affordability, we need to plan for affordability. What I would like to see is Sherwood looking for lands within their expansion boundaries that they would be able to RFP for regulated affordable housing, both on home ownership side and multifamily development.

Fiona Lyon noted, building off the last comment, I would like to see some provision for affordable housing in some tangible way. I think there's some good comments about just the expectation of communities. My goal is to capture good lessons learned for the next cycle. I think what I'm hearing is there is this misunderstanding between community expectation and our region's expectation. Maybe for the next time it would be helpful to do a little bit of analysis and maybe if there's some bookends we could provide for the process that would be helpful.

Before the concept planning starts, I think we were asked to provide technical data, technical advice for impact. I did a little bit of research on industry standards and guidance for what support a transit system in terms of density. I'm happy to share that. I will say it is super challenging for a transit provider to keep growing horizontally rather than vertically. There's a whole variety of factors that contribute to a successful transit system. In terms of density if we're just going to talk about density, suburban communities with local transit service in a shared right of way, there's a target of 15 to 60 or more units per acre, with an average minimum of 10 to 15 dwelling units per acre to support a transit system.

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich wanted to echo some of the comments already made. I think cities don't need additional conditions on density, especially if you've already gone through a two-year planning process with your community, and you know what they'll accept. It is a political risk to ask for an expansion. If you've gone through the process of getting to a place of agreement that's where you need to start. If there are other impositions, it's going to make it very challenging for the community to accept it. Sherwood is one of those communities that recently had voter approved annexation that only went

away because of the legislature. Their community is very active and if there are greater densities imposed that these concepts may not become realized.

Carol Chesarek noted I heard Ms. Terway say that there's a well thought out density requirement that's in place. I haven't seen any sign of a minimum density requirement mentioned anywhere in the plan or the analysis. So, if it exists, I've missed it. One of my concerns as we're already backsliding is the next proposal is going to be even lower density. The whole point of these state laws that we've recently enacted is to be increasing densities above what we were building before getting more density for more affordability for fewer greenhouse gas emissions and better transit support. I feel that what's happened is that Sherwood's aimed for the 10 units per acre which used to be a state minimum. I feel they factored back based on all these new rules that said we only need 6.3. Instead of starting at 10 and having those new state laws bump you up to higher densities that gets you the more affordable homes. It gets you the reduced greenhouse gases. To go to lower densities means higher infrastructure costs per home, less affordability, less transit, less walkability. If the Sherwood community is concerned about added traffic the way you get out of added traffic is the walkability and the transit service with the higher density. They've got 42% of the residential acreage set outside for the lowest density housing which is 3 ½ units per acre. To me, today, that is unconscionable to be at that range. So higher density minimum requirement, please.

Patricia Diefenderfer had a question similar to what Ms. Chesarek said about the minimum density requirements that people are referring to. Can someone clarify what this is, where that requirement comes from and what level of density that is that we were talking about. Mr. Reid noted there are a few things I can mention. One is the state's metropolitan housing rule which has been in administrative rules for a number of years now. It establishes the minimum densities for cities in the Metro area. For the City of Sherwood that minimum density is six units an acre. In terms of the 10 units an acre, Metro used to have concept planning requirements that established 10 as the minimum the same time that the region adopted urban or rural reserves and shifted to this process where cities completed concept plans and proposed expansions. We go rid of the 10 units an acre minimum. Metro participates at the staff level in these local planning efforts. So, to the extent there was discussion of densities in the Sherwood concept planning process I think there was some confusion at Metro's staff level about what that plan included.

Ms. Diefenderfer wanted to clarify the six units, that's not a maximum. It's a minimum under it's state administrative rules. This was confirmed. It was noted the City of Portland's position is similar to some of the comments heard about the need for more housing, higher densities, the cost associated with the lower density development and the affordability issues, essentially single dwelling at six to nine units per acre which means very expensive single family detached houses. Probably in the range of seven to \$800,000 at minimum. The City of Portland is supportive of densities that are more akin to the middle housing densities. The commitment to having a minimum density of closer to the 16 dwelling units per acre feels important from the perspective of the City of Portland. But the socioeconomic demographic changes that are happening in the region, and some level of commitment or target towards affordability, ideally something in the neighborhood of 10% of the units being affordable to households making 60% or lower of median family income is meaningful.

Chair Kehe noted details offered in terms of what an affordability condition could look like and put on the table 10% of units in the expansion area. Another mentioned specifically asking the city to look for land in the expansion area to put up for RFP for subsidized affordable housing. Those are specific to affordable housing. More comments are welcome.

Nora Apter appreciated the conversation and echoed some of the questions and concerns. We are excited to see the efforts to address the region's housing needs and from OEC's perspective, as we're thinking about delivering on housing access and affordability, we want to make sure that as much as possible we're prioritizing health and affordability and resilience for the people living and working in them. After digging into both the COO's recommendation and the Sherwood proposal we have questions about broader indications for climate and the overall health of our communities. We want to make sure that we're supporting transit oriented and inclusionary houses that are essential to creating access to services and community buildings. We appreciate what others have raised around the recommended density and preferred density and what it might mean in terms of supporting effective transit and walkability, reinforcing less car dependent, as well as sustainable infrastructure development to meet our region's climate goals. A link was shared to the committee on a report from the DEQ released that focused on consumption-based emissions and includes information on the importance of using existing commercial and residential buildings to reduce emissions from new construction.

Faun Hosey wanted to remind the group the reason we're doing all this and the reason we did 12 years ago, the rural reserves, urban reserves, and now using the urban reserves for urban growth boundary is that Senate Bill 100 was written to help protect our natural resource of prime farmland, which our cities are surrounded by. We're using our urban reserves so fast right now that they're not going to last the 50-year period. That was projected and the reserves will be at risk. That is short-sighted. We really need to understand where we'll be in 50 years. That's what we're doing when we talk about density, transit and cities that need to work harder.

The committee took a 5-minute break

When the meeting resumed Chair Kehe asked for additions to the comments about housing, both density and affordability. Other topics could be discussed before we take a vote.

Brendon Haggerty, in consultation with my public health colleagues in Washington and Clackamas Counties, arrived at a similar concern about density for a reason that hasn't come up yet, which is physical activity and active transportation through walking and biking. Physical activity is protective against the leading causes of illness and premature death in our region. Public health research is conclusive that higher densities support more physical activity. Right now, only the densest parts of our region reach levels of density that optimize the level of physical activity that we need to protect health. We're in agreement with other comments calling for higher minimum densities.

Anna Slatinsky wanted to share comments addressing the potential for a condition related to affordable housing. It's clear we need to be serious about what it takes to meet the housing needs of people who have lower incomes. It's clear that those means are not being met currently. It's very unlikely that newly built housing that is not subsidized in a significant way will be able to be affordable for that income range. The kind of more middle affordability ranges that potentially could be market rate. Again, the small units matter. I have no argument about any of that.

What I want people to consider is what it means to place the burden on delivering regulated low-income housing on small jurisdictions who are simultaneously shouldering the burden of planning infrastructure and review and inspection of new housing. These are not trivial responsibilities. They're big, expensive responsibilities, utilities, transportation, infrastructure. These have dedicated funding mechanisms associated with them. There's a number of albeit limited funding streams for

transportation. Utility improvements can be funded through SDC's through rate payers. But when it comes to acquiring property or subsidizing affordable housing that usually comes from a city's general fund, Construction excise tax can help but is limited. It's limited by state law. The potential for a jurisdiction the size of Sherwood to be able to generate significant revenue through CET to build affordable housing is not plausible. Cities can't do it themselves.

The housing development in South Cooper Mt. would not have happened without the City of Beaverton writing checks and Metro's Housing Bond. We need to face the facts that jurisdictions have really limited budgets. Examples of these decreasing revenues of income for housing development to jurisdictions were given. There's not enough money to do all of the things we believe are important. Huge trade-offs are difficult to make. We're already operating in a context where there's a tremendous amount of attention at the state, regional and local level to our housing crisis.

We have folks here who can talk in more detail about what the state is doing to support and require jurisdictions to do careful, long-term planning to understand how they can meet the housing needs and to make commitments through creating a housing strategy that will look comprehensively at what cities can do in order to meet those needs that those systems are getting put in place. It's not going to be helpful for Metro to throw it in there because it's important. Yes, it's important. Is this the right mechanism for reinforcing the ability of Sherwood to deliver affordable housing; I would argue no, because those requirements are already being placed through other mechanisms. If they are placed, if Sherwood ends up with a requirement to produce X units of low-income housing, how are they going to pay for it? I don't know Sherwood's finances but in Beaverton we've spent a lot of money and right now we don't know what we're going to be able to have in the future.

Terra Wilcoxson noted comments related to affordability and conditions of approval. I wanted to echo that cities will be required to plan for their own allocations which include unit level affordability. I have some concerns. There is a very intensive process going through your HCA and HPS and all the owner requirements. I would suggest that Metro recognize that the owner is being put in place rather than adding an uncoordinated layer to housing affordability.

Jessica Pelz wanted to echo what Ms. Slatinsky and Ms. Wilcoxson said. Of course, affordable housing is important, but it can't come without a funding commitment by Metro and others. We can't put that on the city as a condition. I also wanted to say about the density that we support the city's plan with a proposed range of density. Someone noted previously that expansion areas are already being built above what they have put in their concept plans. I think that's a good indicator of that cities is doing their concept plan, they're getting community support, and then they are letting the market sort of control what's getting built according to the zoning at the local level. I think that is something we should continue with Sherwood. I think it's time that we have a range of densities throughout the Metro region.

Patricia Diefenderfer added there's affordable housing capital "A" and affordable housing "a". The case for middle housing is really also about not just subsidized affordable housing but housing at market rate levels that are naturally more occurring by virtue of the smaller lot size. I think that's an important part of the mix, as well as multi-dwelling housing.

Jamie Stasny wanted to talk a little about industrial lands. There's been a lot of discussion about the analysis that was done for industrial lands. Additional analysis was done looking at site criteria and characteristics. I like the flexibility and thinking outside the box, and acknowledgement of the fact that

we need certain sites to meet market need. I think what we would like to see as a commitment to go a bit further because we understand that there's this 10% slope, what will be calculated into the buildable lands inventory. There's been some challenges noted that 7% is the highest slope that we can build on. I think there's some issues with that as well as the identified issue of knowing that most of the sites that are available inside the UGB are smaller. We don't actually show a need for industrial land expansion except for by site criteria.

So, what we would like to see is a commitment from Metro on either participation in or form a work group to identify more of these issue and work with community and private partners to understand how they can better meet the needs of the private sector. I think we all want to plan for a future where we have economic vitality and support that into the future. We know there's a problem. How can we work together to fix it? It would be helpful to see Metro step up and agree to a condition to work with a group to work through these issues and committing to fixing this before we go back and do the next UGR process. Now's the time to make the commitment and we would like to see that condition be added.

A slide was shown on the proposed recommendation for Metro:

Metro agrees to create and host or commit to having Senior staff participate in a task force ending no later than mid-2025 with a report back to the Council highlighting opportunities for creating growth and capacity models that are more reflective of market realities. The goal will be to work with local jurisdictions and private sector partners to address the employment lands challenges identified through the UGR process including but not limited to slope and lot size.

Glen Bolen reiterated what was mentioned at the previous meeting, the importance of preserving that industrial land at large sites. The city has done really detailed work on their economic opportunities, analysis and their targeted job search. Title Four is a good example of ways we can add some condition there to help protect that land from becoming low wage, high trip generation jobs. Oftentimes when industrial land sits for a while, people are tempted by the market asking to do different things. I think some industrial protections are on the table. I think we would definitely like to see that.

Preston Korst noted looking at the city's housing needs analysis and economic opportunity analysis shows that at least on the housing side I think they needed 900 or so housing units, and they're going above and beyond with over 3,000 units. I think recognizing the city's need for growth and what they actually are required to do versus what they are planning to do; we should recognize the fact that they are going above and beyond, and we shouldn't place an undue burden on them from trying to reach those heights above what they're already required to do.

Erik Cole noted what I would offer is kind of a more comprehensive perspective, because that's where I spend a lot of my time related to growth and fighting for our economic future in the region. And as it relates to industrial land and recruitment. EcoNorthwest has done this series supporting the Governor's task force. If you've seen their most recent predictions around our local economy the Metro areas is showing up as 50th among the 50 top metros in job growth in the last 12 months. It's a really stark data point. We're 47th in manufacturing, we're 37th in construction, and 49th in leisure and hospitality.

The other thing they found is that Oregonians are working at record rates, so there's not really any room for more efficiency. I think the other piece we have to consider is in addition to the challenges around in migration, leveling out, are the demographic factors of what we're facing in terms of natural demographic change.

A colleague said it very well; I think we're getting to a place in as a region where we've got to make some tough choices and identify our priorities, and I think we have to be able to fund and maintain those priorities. In order to do that I think we're going to have to look at some things the region hasn't looked at in the past. And the more we can do to incentivize and support the private sector in these areas and look at recruitment and ways to positively find solutions the better. I'd say that's both a general comment about the urban growth report but also supporting the Sherwood expansion without restrictions.

Fiona Lyon noted one of her questions is the industrial land in the north section that's conceptually planned just in order to do assemblage for those large lots. Has there been basic communication with the property owners about willingness to do site assemblage? Mr. Rutledge noted in the Sherwood West concept plan one of the appendices we have speaks to this specifically. This area has pretty large lots already. In order to get to 50 acres there's two different opportunities to combine. In one case, two lots would create 50 acres, and in the other three lots would create 50 acres, which is a great opportunity. Why the recommendation is there is the three different properties that can be assembled are all owned by one property owner. The two would require assembly from two different owners. I'll add there is a lot of interest from developers and from the property owners to get this area developed.

Ms. Lyon appreciated the answer. Suggestions for the next cycle were given. Before the next review begins conduct a policy assessment. I think there are a lot of good tools that the state is producing to help convert land zoned as commercial or otherwise to affordable housing. I think understanding how those tools can be applied in quantified terms of housing production is important. Another idea is if a city brings forward a proposal for a UGB expansion they look at their own public land inventory and see if they are being used ties to best use., can they be converted to mixed use to housing to support some gap that we're looking for in the regional need. I know there is a lot of land within city ownership that is either undeveloped or underutilized parking. I would like to see that assess within the concept plan. Another idea is having a live tool to map these things on a regular basis. Rather than getting to this six-year mark and doing a deep dive plunge into research, I think it would be helpful as planners and transit-oriented development specialists to have that live database if possible.

Mary Kyle McCurdy noted we are fine with the recommendation that Clackamas County made. I think it's for a next urban growth report analysis, but sooner is better than later. I think the condition would be placed now and then we would be asking for that to happen next year. My caveat to that is given that it wouldn't be utilized and adopted in this decision, I'm not sure it's appropriate. There could be other revisions to how the urban growth report is approached that's not for the purpose of this decision. But we support the general notion.

I think it might take longer than mid 2025 because I'd also want to ensure that it includes analysis of other things like redevelopment of existing industrial and commercial sites. We have over a million square feet of empty warehousing houses in the region. There's commercial one-story office parks that are fairly low value that could be redeveloped. I'd want to make sure that we include all of that as well as the Title IV type protections that I think the City of Portland and others brought up. Just make sure it encompasses a full look of the full range of employment and industrial needs and how we can redevelop and create and protect patient ownership of particularly valuable lands.

For future urban growth report analysis, we are serious about the idea that concept plans to meet the region's needs, whether it's for employment or housing, should not be limited just to urban growth boundary expansions. Many cities don't even have the opportunity to expand on urban growth

boundary for a variety of reasons. We think there should be an opportunity for cities to come forward and show how they will meet that need within their own jurisdictions and therefore benefit from the attention and investments that Metro makes into that project, including planning for that. Again, you don't have to wait until the next urban growth report to take into account climate inequities since they're already in your sixth desired outcomes.

Patricia Diefenderfer wanted to reiterate what has been said about the need to ensure that the area that would be brought in as an expansion for industrial use would be designated as an employment area, ideally designated as large lot regionally significant industrial area on the Metro Title 4 maps. I think right now there's a proposal that allows other uses within the industrial land, open space recreation. Those uses should not be allowed in these industrial lands, and with a preference for 50 plus acre size.

Laura Terway gave support for both the condition put forward by Clackamas County as well as the Title 4 industrial, the regionally significant part. It feels like you'd probably need more feedback from the City of Sherwood to make sure that is feasible. Again, the importance of local participation in the process.

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich wanted to support the condition put forward by Clackamas County. And I wanted to reiterate the importance of what Ms. Slatinsky and Ms. Wilcoxson said about housing affordability.

The slide was shown again on the proposed recommendation for Metro:

Metro agrees to create and host or commit to having Senior staff participate in a task force ending no later than mid-2025 with a report back to the Council highlighting opportunities for creating growth and capacity models that are more reflective of market realities. The goal will be to work with local jurisdictions and private sector partners to address the employment lands challenges identified through the UGR process including but not limited to slope and lot size.

Chair Kehe noted this is specifically asking for Metro do some work prior to the next cycle to talk about how we address this industrial land capacity inside the growth boundary. Ms. McCurdy added some helpful comments about it, including additionally the issue of redevelopment of existing industrial and employment lands., and how these could be considered in the future as well. So, I think it's a body of work. Comments or concerns were asked if supporting the idea of adding that redevelopment component to this proposed recommendation was acceptable. Ms. Stasny was asked her thoughts on the issue.

Ms. Stasny noted I think it makes sense to take a look at the whole picture. I just want to emphasize market reality is important and having private public partnership in the conversation is important. Because we can make a bunch of roles and assumptions, but if they're not actually going to come to fruition it's sort of pointless. I know Jerry Johnson did a lot of work on the proforma on the housing side for assumptions around redevelopment. But I don't think as much of that proforma approach was taken. So, I think it makes sense to look at the whole picture.

Mr. Reid added, just to clarify, we did use the proforma approach for employment lands as well and it didn't comprise much of the employment land inventory, the redevelopment side. But I think there's some good questions there about whether that is true or not.

Patricia Diefenderfer added I think not suggesting that there'd be redevelopment of industrial land to other uses necessarily. Just looking at the developability of industrial lands. In the City of Portland, for example, there's many constraints in our industrial lands and in infrastructure constraints and other constraints. So, looking at how to be able to use existing industrial land more efficiently.

Chair Kehe closed discussion on the conditions. Chair Kehe asked for MTAC's recommendation to MPAC regarding the COO's recommendation to expand the UGB to include Sherwood West urban reserve.

MOTION: To provide a recommendation to MPAC to expand the Urban Growth Boundary to include Sherwood West Urban Reserve.

Motion: Preston Korst

Seconded: Jessica Pelz

Discussion on the motion:

Patricia Diefenderfer noted if there are no conditions then I think we would not be able to vote positively for that motion.

Chair Kehe agreed, that would be difficult. This committee doesn't have the opportunity to say for sure what conditions will be put on any expansion. That's Metro Council's prerogative to make that decision. You've given really good feedback. It's hard for me to imagine there won't be any conditions but that's a political process for MPAC and Council. We can't answer that distinctly. You'll have to figure out how you'd like to vote with that uncertainty.

Glen Bolen asked if someone could amend the motion to recommend MPAC consider recommendations of conditions based on the notes taken at the meeting by Metro staff. Chair Kehe agreed. Procedurally you can make an amendment to the motion on the floor.

MOTION: To amend the motion to conditions that there be less than 3,000 units as a housing target and that the industrial land is designated as Title IV regionally significant industrial areas.

Motion: Patricia Diefenderfer

Seconded: Mike O'Brien

Discussion on the amendment:

Chair Kehe asked Mr. Korst if he would accept this amendment to his motion. Mr. Korst declined and preferred to have a vote on the original motion alone. Because I don't think that it's within the prerogative or purview of MTAC to include those conversations. I think it's for Council to consider. Metro Council and MPAC will have those notes for further discussion.

Chair Kehe noted with no acceptance of this amendment to the original motion, we can bring the proposed amendment separately for a vote. Amendment restated:

To support the expansion of the growth boundary with an amendment that a condition be in place for:

- (1) Requiring no less than 3,000 dwelling units in the expansion area and,
- (2) The industrial land in the concept plan be designated as regionally significant designation in Title IV.

Discussion on the amendment:

Anna Slatinsky asked if someone could tell us where the 3,000-unit number falls in relationship to the density ranges that Sherwood has included in their plan. Chair Kehe noted my understanding 9.2 is 3,100 or something units. So 3,000 is just something below 9.2 dwelling units per acre in terms of net density.

Patricia Diefenderfer wanted to make a clarification that the goal here is my understanding was because there's a range of densities, it could be lower. I guess that suggestion is that it just be on the higher end, no less than the minimum.

Jamie Stasny asked if it was possible to have Sherwood join the table to give their response to this request for condition. I'm curious if they're supportive of this condition being placed. Chair Kehe asked for further comments first.

Jessica Pelz had a procedural question. I was under the impression that the tenor of the discussion would be forwarded to MPAC for their consideration and making conditions versus us trying to make conditions specifically, since everyone doesn't agree. Can you spell out how that's expected to go at MPAC next week?

Chair Kehe noted I asked that we give MPAC technical recommendations because I think that's the role of this committee. But the Democratic Rules of Order allow that if anyone wants to make an amendment to that motion, they have the ability to bring that to the table and have it discussed and voted on. That's what happened here. It isn't exactly the recommendation that I had to you about how we would handle a conversation around conditions. We will continue discussing then I will call a vote on the amendment to become part of the motion.

Mike O'Brien asked if Ms. Diefenderfer would be willing to amend her amendment and split it in two for voting. Ms. Diefenderfer noted her understanding is that we're voting on this amendment and then we'll vote on the previous motion. I don't think that splitting it will help. Chair Kehe agreed. We should bring this question to the floor and vote on it. If it's close or fails maybe Ms. Diefenderfer could offer a different amendment.

Carol Chesarek noted from where I'm sitting the housing number is too low, but I fully support the Title 4 part. Ms. Diefenderfer noted she'd be happy for us to split it so that we could take up the industrial issue separate from the housing issue.

Joseph Edge noted while I agree with the spirit of the proposed amendments, I think we should honor the chair's request and have a clean vote on the recommendation first. So, I'm going to vote against the proposed amendments. But I think that it's important to capture if there's tepid support for this on its face. I think that's important to show to MPAC next week. Then our technical recommendations can capture our recommended conditions. That's why I'm going to vote against the proposed amendments.

Kevin Cook noted having a little difficulty understand because we switched to number of units from density, and I think I heard that this is lowering density. I need a little clarification on what number are we looking at here. Compared to the 6.2 range to 9.2, I think was the recommendation from the COO. Chair Kehe clarified that the 9.2 equals about 3,120 units. Ms. Diefenderfer has said 3,000 units. In order to do a vote, we need to do a full roll call through the committee.

Glen Bolen noted in consideration of this vote if it would please the original mover, I would be willing to follow up if this fails with a friendly amendment that says with our approval, we recommend that MPAC consider suggested conditions based on the notes taken by Metro staff during August and September meetings. Chair Kehe agreed to keep it in mind. We have to address the question on the table. We need to go through a full roll call to make a vote. It was suggested we vote on the two conditions (amendment) together, then talk about a different amendment if needed.

MOTION (Restated): To amend the motion to conditions that there be less than 3,000 units as a housing target and that the industrial land is designated as Title IV regionally significant industrial areas.

Motion: Patricia Diefenderfer

Seconded: Mike O'Brien

Action: Motion failed; No 20 votes, Yes 5 votes, abstained 4 votes.

MOTION: To have a condition that the industrial lands be incorporated into the Title 4 regionally significant areas map as a condition of the expansion.

Motion: Patricia Diefenderfer

Seconded: Carol Chesarek

Discussion on the motion:

Jamie Stasny asked for clarification, you're suggesting a Title 4 overlay and also an elevated requirement that it recognizes regionally significant industrial lands, both of those things. This was agreed. Aquilla Hurd-Ravich noted wondering if Mr. Bolen's friendly amendment can be merged with this one so that it's an amendment to condition the Title 4 lands as well as take in all of the notes around the conditions as Mr. Bolen stated.

Chair Kehe noted your point being that the Title 4 recommendation is in those notes. And what would be forwarded to MPAC would be more specific. Ms. Hurd-Ravich agreed, the amendment would be along the lines of Title 4 lands, and we recommend to MPAC that you take into consideration all of the other comments. Ms. Stasny asked if it were possible to have Sherwood come to the table and share their response. Chair Kehe noted the question on the table is a designation of a Title 4 regionally significant designation on the industrial lands and the concept planning area.

Eric Rutledge noted we've taken a really close look at this. And the City of Sherwood would be in support of an industrial designation but not a regionally significant industrial designation.

Chair Kehe noted the motion on the floor is for industrial. There are different Title 4 designations. One is just industrial which Mr. Rutledge just clarified that's what the city supports. Ms. Diefenderfer has said not just industrial but a Title 4 designation of regionally significant industrial, which is a higher level of requirements. That's the motion on the table.

MOTION: To have a condition that the industrial lands be incorporated into the Title 4 regionally significant areas map as a condition of the expansion.

Motion: Patricia Diefenderfer

Seconded: Carol Chesarek

Action: Motion failed; No 17 votes, Yes 6 votes, abstained 4 votes.

Chair Kehe asked if there were further proposed amendments or discussion before returning to the first motion on the table.

Kevin Cook noted I think it's worth considering an amendment that we do have some conditions. I would think at a minimum what the COO recommendation is should be considered. I am reluctant to vote yes with an expansion without conditions. Chair Kehe asked to clarify what the amendment you're offering would be with exact language. Mr. Cook noted the amendment would be approve the expansion as proposed addressing the recommended conditions as recommended by the COO. Chair Kehe asked to have the slide shown that showed the categories but there is some specificity in housing density. There was a range in the COO's recommendation. I want everyone to be clear on what that language is.

Anna Slatinsky wanted to point out that the COO recommendation didn't actually include specifics about conditions. It was general concepts to be explored. I'm not sure how substantive that would really be. I would hesitate to vote in favor on its face promoting the COO recommendation, because it doesn't have much detail there.

Glen Bolen noted that within Democratic Rules of Order you can poll the group without doing an actual vote, to find out if something's warm or cold which might save time. Chair Kehe thought that a great idea. Mike O'Brien noted it seems superfluous because all this information is going forward anyway. I don't know that voting on it would make much of a difference. After asking for a second to the motion and not receiving any, Chair Kehe noted Mr. Cook's proposed amendment was not moving forward.

Joseph Edge noted normally I'd be hesitant to recommend approval of a UGB expansion. But I think under the circumstances with housing and employment lands needs that we have, and the fact that Sherwood is the one proposal we're getting, and all of the trends that we're seeing for the future that we've been presented over the past year I don't think we're going to have many UGB expansions in the future. I think this is a good opportunity to take a city's interest in providing a UGB expansion with a complete neighborhood they're proposing. It is on the edge of the development. It will probably not be transit friendly. But I think that we're not going to see many of these in the future. Given Sherwood's readiness I think this is OK to recommend approval at this point.

ORIGINAL MOTION: To provide a recommendation to MPAC to expand the Urban Growth Boundary to include Sherwood West Urban Reserve.

Motion: Preston Korst

Seconded: Jessica Pelz

Action: Motion carried; No 3 votes, Yes 20 votes, abstained 4 votes.

Chair Kehe thanked the committee for getting through the meeting with the motions and conversation about these important conditions. You provided a lot of technical expertise. We are going to pull all the notes together and make sure they are available for MPAC next week. This has been a long process to lead to this important decision. You heard a lot of information and analysis and I appreciate your feedback. We'll see you again in October.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting September 18, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	9/18/2024	9/18/2024 MTAC Meeting Agenda	091824M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	9/11/2024	MTAC Work Program as of 9/11/2024	091824M-02
3	Handout	N/A	Democratic Rules Cheat-Sheet: Making Decisions	091824M-03
4	Handout	N/A	Flow Chart Using <i>Democratic Rules of Order</i>	091824M-04
5	Draft Minutes	8/28/2024	Draft minutes from 8/28/2024 MTAC Meeting	091824M-05
6	Memo	9/10/2024	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Ted Reid, Principal Regional Planner RE: 2024 urban growth management decision: MTAC recommendations to MPAC	091824M-06
7	Report	8/26/2024	2024 Urban Growth Management Decision: Metro Chief Operating Officer/Staff Recommendations	091824M-07
8	Attachment 1	August 2024	ATTACHMENT 1: HOUSING CAPACITY, NEED, AND DEFICIT ASSUMPTION DETAILS	091824M-08
9	Public Testimony Letter	9/16/2024	Public Testimony Letter from the City of Sherwood RE: Sherwood West Housing Estimates and Conditions of Approval	091824M-09
10	Public Testimony Email	9/17/2024	Public Testimony Email from Jeff Roberts RE: Sherwood West Support	091824M-10
11	Presentation	9/18/2024	Urban growth management: MTAC recommendations	091824M-11