



Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**
Date/time: Wednesday, October 16, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting via Zoom

Members Attending

Eryn Kehe, Chair
Joseph Edge
Carol Chesarek
Victor Saldanha
Tom Armstrong
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich
Anna Slatinsky
Laura Terway
Steve Koper
Katherine Kelly
Jamie Stasny
Jessica Pelz
Laura Kelly
Manuel Contreras, Jr.
Gery Keck
Natasha Garcia
Nina Carlson
Erika Fitzgerald
Bret Marchant
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
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin
City of Vancouver
Clackamas County
Washington County
Oregon Depart. of Land Conservation & Development
Clackamas Water Environmental Services
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Portland Public Schools
Northwest Natural
City of Gresham
Greater Portland, Inc.
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

Kamran Mesbah
Vee Paykar
Faun Hosey
Jessica Numanoglu
Ashley Miller
Dan Rutzick
Miranda Bateschell
Kevin Cook
Oliver Orjiako
Glen Bolen
Kelly Reid
Cassera Phipps

Affiliate

Clackamas County Community Member
Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
City of Lake Oswego
City of Gresham
City of Hillsboro
City of Wilsonville
Multnomah County
Clark County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Dev.
Clean Water Services

Teresa Neff-Webster
Fiona Lyon
Aaron Golub
Max Nonnamaker
Ryan Ames
Leah Fisher

North Clackamas School District
TriMet
Portland State University
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah County
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington County
Public Health & Urban Forum, Clackamas County

Guests Attending

Abe Moland
Adam Torres
Barry Manning
Jena Hughes
K. Anthony Hernandez
Ryan Singer
Schuyler Warren

Affiliate

Multnomah County
Clackamas County
City of Portland
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development

City of Portland
City of Tigard

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Daisy Quinonez, Eliot Rose, Emily Lieb, Eryn Kehe, Glen Hamburg, Isaiah Jackman, Jai Daniels, Joe Gordon, Kim Ellis, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Melissa Ashbaugh, Miriam Hanes, 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. Logistics with in-person meetings and virtual were reviewed.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Updates from committee members around the region – none given

Preview Comprehensive Climate Action Plan/ Climate Partners’ Forum (Eliot Rose, Metro) Mr. Rose provided an update on the US Environmental Protection Agency grant to create a comprehensive climate action plan for the Portland Metro area. This is the most comprehensive climate plan that Metro’s every created. It covers all communities in the region, an entire seven county Portland and Vancouver Metro area. It covers all sources of greenhouse gas emissions. So not just transportation and land use, but it also mentions buildings from industry and agricultural and natural areas. We will be bringing this work to MTAC as it picks up in 2025. The plan we’re working on now is due at the end of 2025.

For any folks on MTAC representing public agencies or community-based organizations you are welcome to join the climate partners forum, which is a group of technical staff from around the Metro area that work on different expertise’s with things having to do with climate. They are our main technical steering group for this work. It meets bi-monthly on the third Tuesday. The next meeting is October 22. If you work for a jurisdiction that has climate work underway or if your staff counterparts are doing deep climate work and you’re not plugged into this, feel free to reach out. The Metro webpage for the EPA-funded Comprehensive Climate Action Plan/ Climate Pollution Reduction Planning Grant: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/tools-partners/grants-and-resources/climate-pollution-reduction-planning-grants>

Report on outcome of Metro Council Public Hearing on the Urban Growth Report (Chair Kehe) An update on MPAC’s action following the MTAC September meeting was provided. The summary was provided onscreen:

September 25, 2024: MPAC recommendations to Metro Council regarding the 2024 Urban Growth Management decision

Motion: MPAC recommends the COO/Staff Recommendation to the Metro Council for approval.

Amendment: MPAC recommends that Metro Council adopts the high growth forecast instead of the baseline forecast (*found on page 6 of the COO/Staff Recommendation*).

Amendment: 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.

Amendment: Metro shall not impose any additional requirements on the City of Sherwood that are not articulated in the Sherwood West Concept Plan.

The motion and amendments pass.

The motion means an expansion of the Urban Growth Boundary for the City of Sherwood. The three amendments were similar to what MTAC recommended. Metro Council had a public hearing and a work session. Metro Council directed staff to move forward with the development of an ordinance to expand the urban growth boundary, accepting the forecast in the Urban Growth Report, the baseline forecast asking us to work on several categories of conditions that were articulated in the COO recommendations. Those were still not made very specific but will be worked on over the next month. Metro Council will have their first reading of that ordinance in November followed by a decision early in December.

Public Communications on Agenda Items none given

Consideration of MTAC minutes September 18, 2024 meeting

Chair Kehe moved to accept as written minutes from MTAC September 18, 2024 meeting.

ACTION: Motion passed with no objections, one abstention; Gery Keck.

Proposed Amendment to Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) Title 4 Map for Montgomery Park Ordinance 25-1522 Recommendation to MPAC (action item) (Glen Hamburg, Metro/ Ryan Singer, City of Portland) Mr. Hamburg provided an overview of a recommendation to MPAC on an amendment to the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (UGMFP) for the Montgomery Park area of Portland. The City of Portland is considering an extension of streetcar service through, and associated land use changes in, the roughly 74-acre Montgomery Park area. The City’s land use proposal, known as the “Montgomery Park Area Plan” (MPAP), looks to transition the area into a new transit-oriented, mixed-use district that supports job growth and housing development with a focus on equity and affordability.

Metro regulations do not prohibit residential land uses in the Montgomery Park area. However, Metro regulations in UGMFP Title 41 and the Title 4 Map currently require the City to prohibit/limit certain public, recreational, commercial, and service uses in the area. Such uses, if allowed by Metro, may be supportive of future residential land uses, facilitate the development of transit-oriented complete communities in an underdeveloped but central area of the region, and advance other RFP policies. Allowing such uses would also be responsive to comments expressed in public testimony.

Removing Metro's Title 4 prohibitions/limitations on certain public, recreational, commercial, and service uses would require an ordinance of the Metro Council amending the Title 4 Map to no longer designate the Montgomery Park area as a 'Regionally Significant Industrial Area' (RSIA) or 'Employment Area'. At a July 23 work session, the Metro Council directed Metro Staff to propose an ordinance amending the Title 4 Map to remove the Title 4 RSIA and Employment Area designations in the MPAP area in order to better achieve the policies of the RFP listed below.

Ryan Singer with the City of Portland provided details on the Montgomery Park Area Plan. The Montgomery Park Area Plan envisions a dynamic, low-carbon, mixed-use neighborhood with equitable access to housing and economic opportunity. Key plan objectives are middle-wage jobs, affordable housing, affordable commercial space, climate resilience, and public open space that would be achieved through public policy changes and actions that leverage private investment.

The plan concept highlights:

- Create a new mixed-use neighborhood west of Highway 30 served by an extension of Portland Streetcar.
- Change land use designations from industrial and employment to facilitate a broader mix of uses.
- Create potential for 2,000+ new housing units with 200+ affordable units.
- Incentivize jobs in the area including middle-wage jobs.
- Retain an employment buffer along NW Nicolai Street to reduce conflicts.
- Retain industrial zoning and preserve industrial land east of US 30.

Proposed transportation improvements were shared.

Through a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory tools MPAP is expected to create opportunities for:

Housing

- 2,000+ units of housing
- 200 – 300 units of which would be income restricted
- Capacity to house 4,000+ new residents

Economic Development

- 4,000+ new jobs in a variety of fields
- At least 800 of which are targeted as middle-wage jobs
- 500,000 square feet of employment space of a variety of types
- Estimated 8,000 – 14,000 square feet of affordable commercial space

Public Realm

- 40,000 square foot park/open space
- 12 – 15-foot sidewalks throughout
- Placemaking and Public art commemorating York

Transportation

- 1.3 miles of track, .65-mile streetcar extension
- Serving 3,000+ new riders daily
- Reconstruction of NW 23rd Avenue and build out of NW Roosevelt and NW Wilson streets

The plan's approach and objectives were shared. Zoning and public benefits agreements were shared related to housing, jobs, transportation, open space/resiliency, and quality design.

Comments from the committee:

Carol Chesarek noted being disappointed in the materials that we were presented with. I think it's a wonderful plan and will probably support it. But we're talking about giving up regionally significant industrial land and other industrial land that's in the heart of the city near transportation. I don't see any mention why we think that's OK or what effect that has on our overall industrial and supply. It may be the right trade off to make, but please, at least in the future, give us that downside of what we're losing and what pressures it might create elsewhere. You mentioned that they were adding 200 affordable units that would be a 77% increase across the Northwest. I think you meant this part of Northwest as opposed to all of Northwest Portland, because I think there's probably more than 200 units of affordable housing in all of Northwest Portland.

Ryan Singer noted we had a robust discussion of this with our planning commission and expect to continue having those conversations as we go to City Council. The proposed Montgomery Park area plan would convert 34 acres of industrial employment land to mixed use land. This represents .2% of the total industrial employment land base, which is about 13,000 acres in Portland. That represents 3% of the 1,000 or so acres of buildable land in the harbor and airport district which is sort of specific industrial land. We're thinking about that and how that fits into our industrial land goals as well. There was a concerted effort to preserve what we see as the most active and healthy industrial areas.

Tom Armstrong noted we're also preserving the middle wage employment opportunities that the traditional industrial land provides with those job targets that are specific to the mixed-use area for middle wage jobs. Mr. Singer added the housing statistics that I pulled were from the Portland Housing Bureau and they were specific to the northwest town center area. A little bit might include outside this, too. It doesn't include affordable housing in the Pearl District.

Glen Hamburg some of the limitations or prohibitions with this area under UGMFP Title 4. A map was shown with Title 4 industrial and employment areas highlighted. Comments and feedback on the plan generated interest in having a park that could serve the larger Northwest Portland area, grocery store, community center, and developing a walkable, transit-oriented community. Because several of these would be prohibited under Title 4, regional policies outlined in the memo packet could be used to promote compact urban form as climate action strategy, infill and redevelopment, biking, walking and transit use, access to parks, schools, and public facilities, and high-density, mixed-use, transit-oriented urban centers. With this in mind, a proposed map amendment was shown that removed Title 4 and provided 42 acres of regionally significant industrial area and 17 acres of employment area.

Comments from the committee:

Anna Slatinsky noted having watched this area and also the broader area of Northwest Portland evolve over the last 35 years, I think this is a thoughtful plan, especially the provision of transit and thinking through what will make it function as a mixed-use area. I appreciate the buffer area that will be on that edge adjacent to the heavy industrial areas, which is important. I'd like more information about how uses would be handled in that buffer zone. I also want to confirm that even with removal of the Title 4 designations, the City of Portland would still need to make findings related to statewide planning goal nine that addresses employment and industrial land uses.

Mr. Singer agreed. We are writing those findings. The Title 4 designation is not the most robust kind of policy requirement for Portland to address with this proposal as it goes forward. The buffer area will have employment zoning and comp plan designation which allows for a wide range of industrial uses but prohibits housing. So that's sort of the buffer nature of that. We're also using a planned district so sort of a special zoning district for this area that has buffer provisions on both sides of that line. Housing and industrial uses will need to have planted landscape areas or fences so that the intention is not to have sort of a check by jowl housing juncture.

Dan Rutzick noted with the heavy-duty industry nearby is the City of Portland thinking that this could be one phase of perhaps some future extension of mixed use. Could residential and not so heavy industrial in other adjacent parcels or other side of Highway 30 go beyond this specific geography? Mr. Singer noted they studied the area to the east of Highway 30 intensely. It's different in its composition. It has smaller lots, more active industrial, smaller businesses and it's busy. It didn't have the same opportunities in terms of larger development sites. At this juncture we're not thinking that this is a first step in re-examining that industrial area.

Mr. Rutzick added the proximity of heavy industrial to this proposed area definitely is there's going to be future residents who are going to have concerns about air quality and other things. It's helpful to know what Portland's thinking about beyond just a proposed buffer between the residential and that heavier industrial.

Nina Carlson wanted to reiterate much of what Mr. Rutzick and Ms. Chesarek said. I think that we've seen in the courts with the critical energy hub with a lot of areas a light buffering of trees and fences are not going to give people the quality of experience that they're going to expect over time even if they move in when industry land is there. What I would ask is if we're going to seriously consider this, we perhaps add new land into the Urban Growth Boundary as industrial away from home and redevelop this, because there is no way with the litigation that we have today and the expectation of all the things people have that we can have industry and homes next to each other or at least medium to heavy industry. It just doesn't work. I think this disconnect ourselves from reality and the legal atmosphere out there today. I respect people's need to have nice places to live with parks and schools and walkability, but you don't get to have walkable neighborhoods and an industry together if you're going to have all of the higher air quality and those sorts of things. They're just not compatible. I think we need to look at this more comprehensively.

Mr. Singer noted our partners at PBOT have sort of realigned some of the truck routes. Vaughn Street used to be the main truck route and they're switching that to Nikolai and looking at access to the other alignments. We were thinking about the way that transportation also works through the area and understanding that there are going to be some conflicts. But again, while we are allowing housing and thinking that high density housing is definitely an option. There are also thoughts this could be more of an employment area as well.

Mr. Armstrong added the industrial edge is an issue that we're looking at. We have 68 miles of industrial district butting up against residential areas in Portland. What we're really talking about is moving that edge 500 feet north from where it is today, and then instituting a whole new set of standards for the development of that mixed use area to help mitigate that edge a little bit better than what we have in terms of the existing development along Vaughn and Wilson Street.

Glen Bolen noted with the question at hand being to modify the 2040 map, basically changing the title four areas, one of my questions would be what you're describing matches or exceeds what we would describe as a town center in the 2040 map. I'm wondering if you're considering, while you're amending the 2040 map, not just making it in our neighborhoods, but making it a town center that has benefits in terms of some of the grants Metro does but also some of the benefits related to that.

I appreciate you talking about moving the freight designations. I think there was some recent work there on the Vaughn off ramp of Highway 30 heading north that ODOT will want to make sure we're working on together to make sure we don't have any spill back into the main line because we're going to be changing more different kinds of uses. Ideally these are the kinds of uses that have more intramodal capture and lower VMT and less driving. But we do need to be working together to make sure that we don't have a safety issue for the off ramp.

Glen Hamburg noted on the first questions about the designation of the area as a town center, the answer to that is no. The direction we received from Metro Council is just to tackle this Title 4 overlay and they haven't directed us to consider application of a new town center designation as well. I think that it would be useful to get through the step of having all regional and town centers have an adopted boundary as required under the CFEC rules. Then maybe we can think about how we might add other centers to the 2040 growth concept map more broadly. But the answer is no, we haven't made that part of this proposal at this time.

Mr. Singer added that under the City of Portland's comprehensive plan the Northwest District is a town center designation. We are extending that designation here and would support anything that contributes to Northwest recognition. It is outside of the central city, probably one of the densest areas in the region.

Mr. Bolen acknowledged looking through the city's comp plan. When ODOT does work on our system we determine the urban design context. One of the things is we've got is a master map. I've worked with Zef Wagner at the city, and we've gone through where the comp plan does call for those town centers. So, when your teams are doing any scoping for projects, they know it's a town center type area and they design appropriately. That's just one angle of what that designation can do. Again, the CFE areas are like designations of a center that carries more with it in terms of the transportation planning role and the hoops you have to jump through. Are you going to do comp plan and zoning at once or are you considering maybe doing the comp plan modification and then relying on the developers to come in and do quasi-judicial zone changes where you'd have a bit at the apple for your developer agreements? Mr. Singer noted we are doing comp plan and zoning at once and working with the two large property owners to do a public benefits agreement. It's somewhat similar to a development agreement but we wanted to clear the way for development without having additional process.

Carol Chesarek wanted to clarify earlier comments, not so much criticism of the plan as it was the materials that we were presented that didn't explain the industrial impacts and I think should have done more of that. I wanted to back up what Ms. Carlson said. This has been an area where there's been serious concerns about air quality in the past, mostly from Esco. Putting more residential units in the area may not have been thought through. This is also 500 feet closer to that CEI hub that we're really worried about. So could this be paired with some additional restrictions on what's going into that CEI hub as opposed to what the city's currently approved.

It sounds like a lot of the motivation for this with wanting a school, a grocery store, a community center. I would like to know if somebody's done a feasibility analysis on those things because I would be surprised if Portland Parks has money to build a community center in that area. Have we done a market study to know that it would be plausible to get a grocery store to actually build in that area and serve those people similarly with a school as the school district that someone talked with for feasibility to get another school in there. Because if they're not feasible then maybe you don't need this change.

Mr. Singer noted I will say we have had early conversations with schools on this. We weren't triggering a need for a new school here. That's not the driver of it. In terms of parks and open space, part of our development agreement, a public benefits agreement, is to build an open space which the Title 4 designation would prohibit from being realized. I don't think we have a market study. But we had a grocery store owner developer say that they are interested in this rezoning and these changes simply because they think it'd be a good place to locate. So there's some level of interest that we've heard from.

Fiona Lyon had similar questions about the economic feasibility. I wanted to ask about more of the street connectivity and grid thinking. On the map not every street grid needs to be a hundred by a hundred, or a hundred by 200, but it feels like there's still some really large parcels. I wanted to ask about the 27th connection in particular. Looks like today it's a street but in Portland maps it's maybe an easement over private property. I wonder why that segment isn't captured as a future proper public right of way in the plan.

Mr. Singer noted our focus in the transportation plan elements of this have been on Roosevelt and Wilson and then the connections that go there. My understanding is that 27th, if you go out there today it looks and acts like a street. But I believe there's a section of it that's technically not a street. I think it's just an easement. The property owners, as they develop, would need to build out portions of those street grids and do the improvements as things develop outside of Roosevelt and Wilson. Ms. Lyon suggested a consideration that it does need to be included in this area plan to make that a requirement of future development.

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich asked what the instigator of the video from Portland was trying to describe. There was already the trolley expansion, and you thought let's develop around it, or was the main objective to have a transit-oriented development, for lack of a better way to describe it. Along those lines I'm wondering if the Title 4 map doesn't change do your efforts for the trolley extension continue or is that trolley extension negatively impacted if the Title 4 map doesn't change.

Mr. Singer noted my understanding from the Montgomery Park to Hollywood study is that it was a joint transit-oriented development study. The effort was looking at if we extend the streetcar then what are the land use implications. It wasn't done that since we're going to extend the streetcar let's do land use. It was let's do land use and transportation planning together. The northwest study area was selected as there was more bang for the buck in terms of the amount of housing and economic opportunities in the area for pretty minimal streetcar extension. In terms of the Title 4 amendment there are two ways to amend the map. One is working with Metro staff which is the process we are doing now. Or we could apply for an amendment, and we believe we could probably meet the findings to do that. We think there are benefits to doing it this way.

Ms. Hurd-Ravich asked clarification that it won't necessarily impact the extension of the trolley line. Mr. Armstrong added no, but the Title 4 real restriction there is on the commercial uses. Part of all this in

the evolution was Esco demolishing their foundry at that site and then deciding to go a different way with their business plan and selling the site to a group of local developers. With the Title 4 designation they could do residential development, but it wouldn't be the mixed-use area seen in the Pearl or Slab Town areas because of the commercial restrictions that come with that Title 4 designation.

Leah Fisher added in the environmental exposure conversation considerations if future standards maybe made as part of the development, in addition to traffic, transportation, safety, noise and air quality. The Tri-County just completed a recent heat mapping project, and we found that some of these industrial areas are sometimes registering up to 17 degrees hotter than some of its neighboring areas. Just considering heat and thinking about that exposure that will put on nearby residents and employees.

Gery Keck asked if Portland Parks have been involved. I saw your plan shows a 40,000 square foot park that's about the size of Tanner Springs, I believe. I appreciate that you put 2,000 units into this area and most of them aren't going to have yards. I think Parks and open space are going to be critical to make it livable and successful. Mr. Singer noted we were working with Portland Parks closely on how we're addressing the future open space and what that looks like. They have agreed to participate in a process for determining what our open space looks like. And yes to the previous point, we think that open space is an essential piece to addressing some of the heat island effects that we know are an issue.

MOTION: MTAC recommends to MPAC their recommendation that the Metro Council amend the Title 4 Map, as shown in Attachments C, D, and E, pursuant to UGMFP Subsection 3.07.450(g).

Motion: Joseph Edge

Seconded: Fiona Lyon

Discussion on the motion:

Dan Rutzick asked are there areas of the region with a Title IV Regionally Significant Industrial Lands designation that have seen significant residential development? Mr. Hamburg noted I'd have to pull up the map and double check whether it's RSIA or another Title 4 designation, for example just industrial area. There's a large section of the City of Tualatin that is zoned residential despite having the Title 4 overlay. So those areas are permissible as I've mentioned but in that area the city would be precluded from permitting certain other non-industrial and other non-residential land uses. There are various areas around the region that are zoned for residential use despite having a Title 4 overlay.

Nina Carlson noted for any land that these changes make it problematic to be continuing to be used or newly improved to industrial uses, could the city/metro consider adding additional lands for industry in areas that may have fewer conflicts/intersections residential/commercial uses?

Ted Reid noted we look at this question about whether there's a regional need for industrial land at least every six years. As you know, we are in the midst of one such decision right now and the direction we have from the Metro Council is that they intend to add the Sherwood West urban reserve to the UGB. That area will include some Title 4 Industrial lands. More generally, I suspect we counted very little, if any, industrial land capacity in the Montgomery Park area in our 2024 Urban Growth Report since it is largely built out and our analysis showed very little industrial-to-industrial redevelopment potential. So, from this perspective of regional industrial growth capacity, we don't see a "loss" with the proposed Title 4 Map amendment and rezoning.

Faun Hosey noted I'm hopeful that, and I advocate for, the first place to find solutions is inside the UGB and not expansion onto prime farmland. We'll be needing our agricultural economy long into the future; it needs our support now.

MOTION (restated): MTAC recommends to MPAC their recommendation that the Metro Council amend the Title 4 Map, as shown in Attachments C, D, and E, pursuant to UGMFP Subsection 3.07.450(g).

Action: Motion passed with one opposed (Nina Carlson), four abstaining; Laura Kelly, Preston Korst, Carol Chesarek, Leah Fisher.

Community Connector Transit Study Introduction (Ally Holmqvist, Metro) An introduction to the Community Connector Transit Study was provided. In conversations during the recent 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, policymakers, partners, and community members expressed concern about areas of the region that still lack access to the regional transit network today and even in the future, but where opportunities may exist to connect to jobs and other essential destinations.

Community connector transit provides an opportunity to unlock more transportation access in the region and make transportation more equitable. This type of transit includes smaller, nimbler (e.g., deviated route, on-demand) that are not local fixed route bus service. It often is more flexible than a bus – from going off-route to pick up or drop off riders to being by-request whenever needed (like Uber or Lyft). This flexibility can also help people travel to light rail or frequent bus routes that may stop a mile or more away from their home or destination. The strong foundation of recent regional work, coupled with the suite of local planning efforts by agency partners, has set the stage to assess potential solutions for improving community connections to essential destinations and existing and planned frequent transit within the network.

In anticipation of the 2028 RTP update, the work done as part of this study will build on recent transit planning efforts to explore community connector transit opportunities and determine the role it could play providing a service coverage solution as part of the local element of the transit spectrum within the vision. The CCT study will identify the policy framework, future system and priority improvement opportunities in a strategic vision for community connector transit. Key to this will be leveraging and bringing together work done by Metro and local partners to date to consider community connectors as part of a comprehensive regional vision for local transit.

The CCT Study starts in Fall 2024 will be updated in four key phases, ending in Spring 2026. Staff will return to the working group, County coordinating committees, and Metro advisory committees and Council for input to inform each key study milestone provides a summary of these milestones and key touchpoints with stakeholders and decisionmakers in a simplified work plan. The timeline for this work aligns with scoping for the 2028 RTP that is anticipated to begin as early as late 2025.

Comments from the committee:

Carol Chesarek shared she loved the idea. I've heard for years from people in the Bethany area that they don't have good connections to get to Sunset Transit Center for commuting. So, it's a potential solution for them. I also want to urge you to look at areas around Forest Park. We don't have anywhere near the density to support transit here. There's no lines on your map. But a ton of people commute through our area going to and from Washington County, North Portland and Vancouver. We would love to get some of the traffic into shuttle buses or van pools. The other things we don't have is public transit that really brings people to Forest Park.

Fiona Lyon commented this is really an informative presentation and the first time I'm hearing about it. We always hear a desire for this sort of transit, and I think there might be reasons why we don't have it today. It sounds like these shuttles are not in the RTP today. That they would have to be added. I'm curious who is this intended for. Who would these be run by. Are they public. Are they private. What is the vision of who would operate these.

Ms. Holmqvist noted we have working with TriMet in ways that overlaps with other transit offerings. We are thinking of the work being developed at the different agencies and new analysis done. The question about the RTP and if this is in there and then who would be operating these? There are some shuttle providers already in the region that are operating now. There are some projects in the RTP that fund those. Clackamas and Multnomah Counties run shuttles already. Washington County partners with Ride Connection as well. Because we've started the inventory process now, we're also finding that there are lots of other little providers that we're noticing in the region. There's a shuttle at Washington Park that goes around the park. Intel and NIKE have some shuttles that transport employees to and from nearby MAX stations on the private side. There are school and college shuttles as well. There's a mixed bag of providers in the region. One of the things we're doing is trying to get a handle on all of them to be able to better represent that in our inventory and work and planning and thinking about the future with coordination better improved between providers.

Ms. Lyon added I think an inventory would be really helpful and very popular. I worry that this would compete in some ways with some of our services. I think just maybe making sure that there's a really clear coordination with the TriMet service planning team. Regarding accessibility it should make sense to prop up our LIFT program that we already have in place. We do have a huge transit operator shortage still so something to keep in mind. I think this scenario serves a lot of unique markets but could compete with that shortage that we already have. You mentioned sort of shaping TOD and I wonder how that would actually work. What a non-fixed van pool routes would have any impact on land use.

Ms. Holmqvist noted our RTO team has done a lot more work around van pools. ODOT has done a ton of work on van pools as well. I don't know of any particular connection to if that would impact land use. But there is a way to thinking about some of our mobility goals and climate goals. It is a way to connect people that work at the same place and might live nearby each other to carpool in a sense. But through a supported way so that there is encouragement for that. And there is momentum now around restarting that program with support and incentives through the work at ODOT and also our RTO team.

Jamie Stasny noted our commissioner has been advocating for focus and energy and attention to be spent on creating some of these types of first last mile programs for many years. He was excited this morning to hear the presentation, and I know our staff is participating with you on this. It's really important that we figure out how to build ridership. We spend a lot of time talking about fixed route service, talking about high-capacity transit, and the suburban areas of our region. We struggle with that because we don't have the level of service needed to make transit a viable option in many areas. How are we going to move to a place where we can be in that conversation. It's going to be building ridership and that's going to require some of these maybe non-traditional tools to get there. I just want to put that on the record and appreciate this work that you're doing. And also, reiterate our partnership and our energy toward this work, wanting to support and participate and make sure that we're coming up with some good deliverables that we can implement so that we see some change in progress in this direction.

Regional Housing Coordination Strategy: Introduction (Ted Reid, Laura Combs, Daisy Quinonez, Emily Lieb, Metro) The presentation began with a reminder the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis mandated a Regional Housing Coordination Strategy (RHCS) that must be completed within one year of a Urban Growth Boundary decision. Other regions can produce a RHCS voluntarily. This Metro collaboration between the Housing Department and Planning, Development, and Research Department include goals to coordinate with local jurisdictions.

The Regional Housing Coordination Strategy is a list of actions that Metro will undertake to promote the development of needed housing, including:

- The development and maintenance of diverse housing types that are high-quality, physically accessible, and affordable
- Housing with access to economic opportunities, services, and amenities
- Measures, policies, or actions that are coordinated among the local governments within the Metro region
- Actions that affirmatively further fair housing

Examples of actions were given:

- Identifying or coordinating resources that support needed housing production including funding, staff capacity, or technical support
- Identifying local or regional barriers to developing needed housing, including financial, regulatory, or capacity-related constraints
- Coordinating housing production strategies between local governments across the region
- Convening staff responsible for implementing their HPS to share resources, challenges, and lessons learned

Data and analysis are required. These include socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of households living in existing needed housing, market conditions affecting the provision of needed housing, inventory of measures already implemented by Metro to promote the development of needed housing, inventory of existing and expected barriers to the planning or development of needed housing and evaluation of potential strategies.

Comments from the committee:

Jamie Stasny noted we've had conversations with Metro as the counties are working to understand our role in this conversation. For the first time ever, the counties will be required to have housing production strategies for our unincorporated urban areas. We're doing a lot of work now to imagine what that looks like for us and thinking at our level how we'll be coordinating that with our city partners, probably through our coordinating committees. I'm curious if the strategy is to do this staff coordination through MTAC or if there will be some new staff body created to have these conversations.

Chair Kehe noted that's still up in the air. We're working on scoping right now and we will probably be back to MTAC when we have more of a specific scope, but we know MTAC will be involved. So will MPAC. There are other cities who aren't directly represented at MTAC so that coordination will also be important. We'll bring back details about how exactly we do that soon.

Ms. Stasny asked about this concept that's coming forward to form a new committee similar to MPAC but to focus on housing issues and how this coordination strategy work might be connected to that.

Emily Lieb noted as many of you are aware the 2018 affordable housing bond are nearly fully committed. A year ago, the Metro Council directed our COO to develop a recommendation for future funding. That has led to a stakeholder process over the past year. A stakeholder advisory committee. There was some city representation, county representation, jurisdictional as well as other sectors on that committee back in the spring. Our COO delivered a recommendation to the council in July that focuses on the potential to expand the eligible uses of our supportive housing services tax which is an action that would require voter approval. There is ongoing discussion about the potential to refer the measure to voters in May.

Part of the other stakeholder feedback that has been shared with Metro over time has been the need to strengthen governance structures for the supportive housing services measure. That has been a significant part of that conversation as well. What was referred to is the proposal to create a new advisory body. There is a council resolution that has been drafted and will be considered by the council tomorrow. That is largely focused on governance structures specific to the oversight of SHS funds. There is a mention in the proposed resolution of aligning with and considering intersections on implementation efforts. It is still a proposal. This process is being led by our council office and COO. The housing department is providing information and support. What I read in the resolution is an intention that there would be some coordination and alignment.

Daisy Quinonez asked to clarify if Ms. Stasny was asking about the Housing Production Advisory Council (HPAC) at the state that the Governor has convened. Ms. Stasny that acronym is also being put forward for consideration internally at Metro which is what was referred to. I was speaking to Metro's. This was provided with the update by Ms. Lieb. I appreciate that response and understand this is being led by council office. I think there is a lot of very high mention. It's vague and could have a lot of implications and it is unclear what MTAC's role would be, and what HPAC and maybe a new staff group would do. As more information becomes available, I hope we'll continue to have conversations here and that those lines will become clearer as we have more information.

Dan Rutzick noted for Metro's role with the affordable housing and supportive housing services, the big part of housing production strategy is also looking at how to produce the market rate housing as well. As the City of Hillsboro is finalizing its housing production strategy we're trying to see where we could have opportunities within the local governments, county, the regional government to advocate at the state level for more resources for housing. Obviously, it's great if we can get more funds at the regional level for subsidized housing but we also need to leverage that. I think items like advocacy at the state and federal levels for more housing funds would be an important one.

And then also being mindful that as we look to market rate housing in addition to affordable housing there's stuff like the lack of condominiums that are being built because of construction defect viability concerns. I think there is an opportunity across our region to figure out how we can advocate for things that really move the dial as much as possible for housing production.

Washington County is in the process of doing its own housing capacity analysis and housing production strategy as part of OHNA. One thing to be mindful of is whether we're trying to increase housing production in cities or within unincorporated urban areas of the counties that could lead to displacement of folks within the naturally occurring housing space. I think that could be a helpful piece to weave into some of the work. I wanted to ask a question on one of the slides talking about Metro compiling data. Was the attempt to gather from cities recent housing capacity analysis or would Metro's role be in the data collection and compilation?

Ted Reid noted we're still scoping this part of the work. I think your suggestion is a good one that Hillsboro and other cities have begun some of this similar work. We can look to what you've done perhaps for some examples of what has been most helpful.

Joseph Edge noted with respect to displacement in the urban unincorporated areas, I think we need to consider that the urban unincorporated areas are basically indistinguishable from the cities that they're next to. A lot of the people move in and think they're in a city and find out they're not when they don't get to vote in the election. The difficulty in accessing elected officials for your local municipal government when you are competing with 430,000 other residents in Clackamas County for the attention of your legislative body versus in the City of Milwaukie where you're competing with 20,000 or other cities. We need to think about the fact that the unincorporated areas do not have the kind of representation to affect equity or equity goals in the way that we assume they will. That's not to say that we don't put more housing in the unincorporated areas, but we need to be mindful of this fact and encourage annexation of the unincorporated pockets that are outside cities so that we can ultimately get those residents the representation at local government that they deserve.

I think we should be looking to this plan with a coordination effort to encourage the counties to work with their city partners to find ways to bring the areas that are in the defined UGMA into city boundaries and allow those residents to access the services, access local government vote for their representation. The coordination effort needs to give the local governments, particularly the counties who have not been doing this work, the data they need to make decision that will help them succeed. Ultimately, we can look back at the county's housing affordability strategies.

Clackamas County did a three-phase project and in one of the phases they looked at increasing the density of residential allowed in commercial areas, particularly along commercial corridors. One of the things we heard recently with our transit-oriented developments looking along commercial corridors, not just in Portland but in suburbs. If we would have had this data available perhaps when Clackamas County was doing tis work then perhaps they would have allowed the maximum density to go to 100 or 200, or maybe not even have a cap. Or just allow the market to decide so that we could get the kind of investment that is occurring around the suburbs and around the region, which is a hundred units an acre on average, not the max. Clackamas County adopted a max of 60 unites per acre in these commercial zones. That is what we have seen, no development as a result. Because they expect to be able to build a hundred units an acre and they can go somewhere else to some other jurisdiction and do it. I think it's important we get the right data in front of policy makers to make successful decisions.

Preston Korst agreed with Mr. Rutzick when he mentioned the potential that this could have for coordinating efforts to advocate for outside resources for both housing and infrastructure. I think that's a key opportunity for the group to look at. You mentioned work groups that are happening, folding in comments that they have and stakeholders on that table into this process where it makes sense would be smart. It was mentioned sort of by chance the governor's housing production and accountability council task force that the state suggested wherever possible incorporating the regional representative on that group. And trying to incorporate or at least look at any recommendations from that group. And compare maybe doing some sort of exercise to see how different or how similar they are to any coordination strategy to those recommendations. There are a lot of them so it might take a lot of work.

One takeaway that I hope you make is that as much as possible encourage input and engagement from the private development and market rate housing providers in the region. I think that's key. There are a lot of local jurisdictions actually doing that right now with their housing production strategy which we

appreciate. There are a lot of work groups happening across the region so that's good. And from that I think we'll see a lot more opportunities for private and public partnerships and the developments of this strategy. That's something that we should continue to look into. Also, an analysis on home ownership if at all possible. I don't know if you are planning to do subgroups or working groups to analyze specific development barriers that you mentioned, but having a work group on infrastructure needs specifically or permitting, I think would be an interesting one to encourage housing development in the region. Those are sort of my long list of suggestions that you might want to incorporate. I'm happy to provide more offline.

Glen Bolen noted if you are in the early scoping stages you might know, but curious if you are considering using Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan's powers to create requirements that might address parking standards in this plan that can be updated there, or densities and proximity to transit or things like that as a regulatory or just coordination effort. Ms. Quinonez noted we have gotten that feedback from our pre-scoping conversations. So, I think that's something that we can continue to explore. It's too early to say but it's certainly something we can explore.

Manny Contreras noted that as housing development increases so does a demand for infrastructure. One of the things that it will impact are different utilities including sanitation and sewer services that need to have the right capacity to handle the increase. It'd be interesting to see how the ownership of this comes and what approach it takes if it's at a very high level as a strategy, as axioms, or whether it is going to drill down more to identify different locations. The different clean water agencies can respond and participate.

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich noted I think what would be helpful in the long run for cities through this strategy work is if you're able to put together toolkit lists of examples that other cities have used. Many years ago, Metro came out with lots of different toolkits. I'm thinking as my city will start to embark on a production strategy it'd be great to look at some examples that are out there and then go talk to those cities of how they're working or not working. The other thing that I think would be helpful is if there's some way to create a resource list of partnerships of nonprofits or housing providers that cities can work with and partner with because we don't build housing. Most of these smaller cities don't build it and they don't have housing departments that manage housing or even provide the wraparound services. And then maybe we can incorporate those when we do our production strategy.

Ashley Miller noted Gresham would suggest a cross-jurisdictional advisory group for the plan. Gresham has already adopted a HPS and would be happy to provide insights on the HCA/HPS process.

Metro Cooling Corridors Study – Introduction (Joe Gordon, Metro) The presentation began with an overview of the study and why the need to identify these cooling corridors in the Metro area. The tools to be used to implement the study and Metro's role was described. Deliverables from the study:

- Surface & Infrastructure
- Tree Canopy Distribution
- Heat Island Distribution
- Existing Corridors
- Connecting Corridors
- Potential Corridors
- Equity Considerations
- Cost Considerations
- Implementation Options

Engagement with Metro staff, governmental partners, expert consultation, Smart Surfaces Coalition and community-based organizations are planned. The study schedule was provided. Project outcomes were given as understanding current cooling resources and opportunities to reduce impacts of extreme heat on people, developing a network of subject matter experts, CBOs, and governmental partners to engage in urban heat resiliency projects, and to share best practices and use them to inform regional planning, policies and investments.

Comments from the committee:

Manny Contreras noted temperature is considered a pollutant for clean water services under their MS four permits. All clean water agencies do repair in shard planting already. One of the resources that you can touch base with is my organization and the Statewide organization that advocates on behalf of clean water agencies called Oregon Association of Clean Water Services.

Michael O'Brien placed several resources from the American Society Landscape Architects in the chat:

<https://www.asla.org/extremeheat.aspx>

<https://www.asla.org/climateaction.aspx>

<https://www.asla.org/climatemitigation.aspx>

<https://www.asla.org/extremeheatresearch.aspx>

In these links are a ton of articles related to extreme heat and climate cooling with useful information. One thing I would point out is we talk about trees all the time. But you have to consider the ground plan as well when you're working in these areas because it adds significant cooling as well as the canopy.

Joseph Edge noted one of the things I was thinking of is there's a lot of overlap between the kind of green corridors that you're talking about and the urban streams that we have. There are obviously some regulations in place to try to encourage some green corridors already. It would be great to see that bear more fruit because it's basically limited to new development. It would be nice to have other programmatic assistance or solutions able to help private property owners restore the green canopies around the streams that run across or alongside their properties.

Work done from the Watershed Council was mentioned including developing a watershed action plan. The plan identifies areas where we want to see more shard. Encouragement was given to reach out to the Executive Director of the North Clackamas Watersheds Council to discuss the plan. A suggestion was made to connect with the regional habitat connectivity working group because they are focused on the regional landscape scale helping implement the state's connectivity plan. We have actionable policies and regulations in place by the local governments that permit activities.

Leah Fisher noted the heat mapping project that the Tri-County did las summer. That heat scan was conducted in funding from one of our CCOs health share to collect and understand where heat islands exist and some of the characteristics of the built environment that contribute to higher heat in certain areas. We have a local and comprehensive understanding of the heat in the Tri-Counties which I can share more about with you. Part of that study convened focus groups of community-based organizations, health providers and public health folks that are concerned about heat and to understand what kind of resources or supports they need to be able to address heat in the built environment particularly for our most vulnerable community members. We have a list of what can be supportive infrastructure-wise or system-wise that could help as we see a heat increase in the Metro area from climate change. We'll continue to see that trend over time.

We also did that project with over 150 volunteers that were recruited by community-based organizations. We have a list of interested community members that may be a group that you could tap into for this project to connect with as potentially a resource as well. As far as the role of Metro in this it's exciting to see all the work in this space. One thing I've observed is while we know trees and large growth trees have all these amazing benefits there's a lot of jurisdictions that don't have any kind of support for any formalized urban tree department. The City of Portland's a great example of being very active in that space. It's concerning for private property owners to take on putting in trees even in some of these riparian corridors or working with some areas that might be interested but there's a lack of who's going to maintain these trees, make sure they stay healthy and survive. I'd be interested in what Metro potentially provides for resources and support in areas of the region that don't have that local jurisdictional support for managing an urban forest. I feel there's a huge gap there. I'll connect with you after this or down the road to share more.

Brendon Haggerty added Multnomah County Health Dept has been collaborating with our counterparts in Seattle and Vancouver BC on extreme heat. We had a symposium in April on extreme heat interventions; I'll send Joe the final report. More info here: <https://cdrc.uw.edu/key-initiatives/collaborative-on-extreme-heat-events/>

Fiona Lyon noted there's clearly a lot of excitement around this topic. As noted by Mr. O'Brien the ASLA website have great resources. I would add it also has great resources on urban forestry. I appreciated your map extended beyond the Metro region. I think it emphasized that this is an ecosystem wide, watershed kind of topic and needs thinking that way. Related to that are two prongs. There's the urban forestry component and the ground plain material component. It feels like there's not a lot of continuity between the jurisdictions.

As an example, I'm thinking about the tree code. The City of Portland does have a strong tree code. Other jurisdictions around the area do not. I wonder if there's maybe some scope or resources to help elevate and define what that tree code looks like for cities. I would add, having worked in other regions there's not a great comprehensive urban forestry map that exists. I know that the City of Portland started on this a couple years ago but not sure where it's at to date, but literally inventorying every single tree that exists. It can be a huge community input resource. Having been on big transportation project that's looking to do tree mitigation it's hard to find those opportunities for tree mitigation planning. I would add I think CFEC is going to have a huge impact on this whole topic. I haven't had a change to brainstorm what that looks like but maybe there's an opportunity to somehow track how that impact is influencing this space. I think that'd be good value.

Leah Fisher noted a tree code is fabulous and even CFEC's requirements, however, many smaller jurisdictions and counties don't have a system/entity to enforce or support that tree code or added canopy. That is definitely a big hurdle for any kind of comprehensive tree canopy effort. Joseph Edge added Milwaukie is an example of a smaller city with a strong tree code.

Carol Chesarek noted Ms. Lyon reminded me about years ago I was one of the leaders on a regional project to map all of our Oregon White Oak trees. There are a lot better tools available now, but that kind of thing has been done before on a more specific species scale. I wanted to ask about this balance between preserving trees and development and wondering if that's something you're going to touch on, or maybe it's beyond your scope. One of the things Portland found a few years ago is after they increase their density, allowed in some areas, that they lost significant tree canopy in those areas. I don't know what the right balance is but maybe if we could start to have some framework for thinking

about when is that tree so valuable that it's not worth upzoning the land to allow more density. Again, maybe beyond your scope but I've heard from some developers that on properties where there are large trees that maybe they'd like to be able to preserve the way the codes are written, and the infrastructure needs to get built. It's like we can't save that because we have to level the whole property. It would be great if somebody at some point could dig into whether we have things in our code that are counterproductive in terms of tree preservation when we're talking about new development.

Dan Rutzick added it'd be helpful if there were technical resources available at the regional level around right of way materials that can make a difference in terms of cooling the immediate area. Obviously, having mature trees in an urban environment is the best thing you can have. And then there's different landscaping, but I understand havens go in at a lighter color, roads maybe to into a lighter color. It has strong implications on not making the media area be quite as hot. I think combined resources in that space would be helpful for local governments to consider.

Recently, one of our new neighborhoods connected with arborists to identify trees that may be more resilient in the coming decades with climate change. Unfortunately, in my area the emerald ash bore has been identified which will have a big impact over the coming years as trees across the region potentially. I think it would be helpful to have a group of arborists recommend that may be a moving target, but I think there are a lot of local governments that don't have the resources or the know-how to know which trees to plan as part of development. Whether in the right of way or on site. I think that would be another helpful resource.

Mr. Gordon noted the tree species subject in the face of climate change has come up. I like the idea of that being discussed with experts and planned for where we're going. Regarding the road area surfaces, I think that will be where the smart surfaces coalition comes in because that's really their wheelhouse. They can discuss possible mitigation with other types of surface infrastructure interventions and what those look like.

Michael O'Brien noted concentrating on climate change and heat increases will become very important in terms of selection of plant material. I think it would be great if Metro would develop a model code for trees in the urban landscape they could share with jurisdictions. The City of Portland's is very robust but it's not complete. A point to the City of Tigard as an example. They actually require you to document the available soil volume that any tree has which is one of the things that gets completely overlooked in most codes. Soil is more important than plant material in the long run.

The City of Portland and others offer mitigation fees. They take the money and use it to plant trees elsewhere. Generally, it's supposed to be in the general areas of where you are, but that would be an example of partner organizations that could help impact the region maybe at a more effective way than they might if they're concentrating on a small area. Something to think about.

Mr. Gordon noted he would research this detailed example further. Appreciation was given to the committee for their input and ideas. Follow-ups will be made for more information.

Chair Kehe noted it was suggested that MTAC bring in speakers from FEMA and DLCDC to talk about floodplains and topics that a lot of cities are facing for compliance and the need to complete an ordinance spreadsheet demonstrating compliance with the new rules and what that looks like. We'll talk about it more in the future and try to get that onto a future agenda.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:46 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting October 16, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	10/16/2024	10/16/2024 MTAC Meeting Agenda	101624M-01
2	2024 MTAC Work Program	10/8/2024	2024 MTAC Work Program as of 10/8/2024	101624M-02
3	2025 MTAC Work Program	9/24/2024	2025 MTAC Work Program as of 9/24/2024	101624M-03
4	Draft Minutes	9/18/2024	Draft minutes from 9/18/2024 MTAC meeting	101624M-04
5	Memo	10/9/2024	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Glen Hamburg, Associate Regional Planner RE: Proposed Amendment to UGMFP "Title 4 Industrial and Other Employment Areas" Map for the Montgomery Park area of Portland	101624M-05
6	Presentation	10/16/2024	Montgomery Park and Metro's Title 4 Map	101624M-06
7	Memo	10/9/2024	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Introduction to the Community Connector Transit Study	101624M-07
8	Attachment 1	June 2022	Attachment 1: Public Transit 101 Fact Sheet	101624M-08
9	Attachment 2	July 2024	Attachment 2: Community connector transit study fact sheet	101624M-09
10	Attachment 3	N/A	Attachment 3: Project Milestone Work Plan: Key Activities and Events	101624M-10
11	Attachment 4	10/1/2024	Attachment 4: Community Connector Transit Study: Working Group #1 Agenda	101624M-11
12	Attachment 5	September 2024	Attachment 5: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN	101624M-12
13	Attachment 6	N/A	Attachment 6: REGIONAL TRANSIT FEEDBACK SUMMARY	101624M-13
14	Presentation	10/16/2024	Community Connector Transit Study	101624M-14
15	Handout	N/A	September 25, 2024: MPAC recommendations to Metro Council regarding the 2024 Urban Growth Management decision	101624M-15
16	Presentation	10/16/2024	MONTGOMERY PARK AREA PLAN	101624M-16

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
17	Presentation	10/16/2024	Regional Housing Coordination Strategy: Introduction	101624M-17
18	Presentation	10/16/2024	Cooling Corridors Study	101624M-18