



# Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, April 17, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual video meeting via Zoom

---

## **Members Attending**

Eryn Kehe, Chair  
Joseph Edge  
Carol Chesarek  
Victor Saldanha  
Tom Armstrong  
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich  
Laura Terway  
Steve Koper  
Katherine Kelly  
Jamie Stasny  
Jessica Pelz  
Laura Kelly  
Manuel Contreras, Jr.  
Gery Keck  
Nina Carlson  
Tom Bouillion  
Bret Marchant  
Mary Kyle McCurdy  
Rachel Loftin  
Preston Korst  
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  
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley  
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin  
City of Vancouver  
Clackamas County  
Washington County  
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development  
Clackamas Water Environmental Services  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
NW Natural  
Port of Portland  
Greater Portland, Inc.  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
Community Partners for Affordable Housing  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Mayer/Reed, Inc.  
Multnomah County

## **Alternate Members Attending**

Kamran Mesbah  
Faun Hosey  
Dan Rutzick  
Dakota Meyer  
Martha Fritzie  
Kevin Cook  
Theresa Cherniak  
Glen Bolen  
Kelly Reid  
Cassera Phipps  
Natasha Garcia  
Fiona Lyon  
Jerry Johnson  
Scott Bruun  
Sarah Radcliffe

## **Affiliate**

Clackamas County Community Member  
Washington County Community Member  
Largest City in Washington County: 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  
Portland Public Schools  
TriMet  
Johnson Economics, LLC  
Oregon Business Industry  
Habitat for Humanity Portland Region

Jacqui Treiger  
Kerry Steinmetz  
Erin Reome  
Ryan Ames  
Leah Fisher

Oregon Environmental Council  
Fidelity National Title Greater Metropolitan Portland  
North Clackamas Parks & Rec. District  
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington County  
Public Health & Urban Forum, Clackamas County

**Guests Attending**

Becky Hewitt  
Bruce Coleman  
Jan Frutiger Tysoe  
Marc Farrar  
Michael Veale

**Affiliate**

ECONorthwest  
City of Sherwood  
City of King City  
Metropolitan Land Group, LLC

**Metro Staff Attending**

Al Mowbray, Ally Holmqvist, Andrea Pastor, Cindy Pederson, Clint Chiavarini, Daisy Quinonez, David Tetrick, Dennis Yee, Eliot Rose, Eryn Kehe, Jake Lovell, Jess Zdeb, Lake McTighe, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krueger, Ted Reid, Tim Collins

**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. New incoming MTAC members and alternates attending the meeting were welcomed.

**Comments from the Chair and Committee Members**

Eliot Rose provided an update on the Climate Pollution Reduction grants. Metro received a grant from EPA that is a planning grant to create a regional climate action plan for the Metro Statistical Area. This includes our partners at the Regional Transportation Commission in Clark and Skamania County in Washington, as well as Yamhill and Columbia Counties. The way the grant is set up projects that were included in the plan were eligible to apply for follow up implementation grants that EPA made available right after the plan was due. Metro submitted the first deliverable for that priority climate action plan on March 1. A link to this was shared in chat: Metro's final Priority Climate Action Plan can be found here: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/tools-partners/grants-and-resources/climate-pollution-reduction-planning-grants>. Please email me at [eliot.rose@oregonmetro.gov](mailto:eliot.rose@oregonmetro.gov) if you have any questions.

Those follow up applications for implementation grants were due April 1. We had five different applications go in from across the region with a total value of close to a hundred million dollars. Those included applications to electrify transit buses led by TriMet, collaboration between TriMet and Metro to fund projects that move transit through traffic more quickly. A grant by Gresham to green some of their wastewater treatment facility practices so they could recapture was gas and use it as energy. A big application by Washington County in collaboration with Clackamas County and Vancouver Housing Authority to provide energy retrofits to publicly managed affordable housing units. And an application led by Metro to fund more energy efficient units through the Transit Oriented Development program that we run to construct affordable housing near transit. We should hear whether any of those got awarded over the summer and will update the committee. We have another round of planning to do under this grant. That will be starting in summer 2024 and running through the end of 2025.

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** – none given.

### **Consideration of MTAC minutes March 20, 2024 meeting**

Chair Kehe asked for a vote to approve MTAC minutes from March 20, 2024 meeting.

**ACTION: Motion passed with no opposed, and 2 abstentions: Mary Kyle McCurdy, Brendon Haggerty.**

### **Urban Growth Boundary Decision: Historic residential development trends** (Ted Reid & Al Mowbry)

Mr. Reid provided an overview of the presentation. Information will provide data on current and future housing needs, housing types and development trends in terms of vacant land vs redevelopment. Historic residential data has been compiled to respond to some of the requirements that are laid out in state law for our growth management decisions. This data presented is called the Land Development Monitoring System (LDMS).

Mr. Mowbry noted we have about 260,000 acres in the urban growth boundary. Increasingly we are trying to increase the number of housing units and businesses redeveloping already developed space to increase growth and continue growth in the region. Land use inside the UGB shows that almost half of the acreage zoned is single family usage. Recent laws have changed to allow more types of housing on single family lots. That's where we start to allow some middle housing. Some the things we think as commercial space are zoned industrial. Increasingly land is becoming mixed use zoning.

Land definitions and housing definitions were described. There are 739,766 total housing units in the UGB as of 2023. Fifty two percent of this is single family detached, and 30% multifamily. The largest housing type growth rate came from multifamily/on site commercial. Vacant land consumption by housing comparison between infill/redevelopment and vacant land consumption was shown.

Comments from the committee:

Manuel Contreras asked is the reason we're building more multifamily dwellings relative to single family residential due to policy changes or market chain. Mr. Mowbry noted part of the reason is we're planning for density, building up and not out. As we plan for more density that is what's getting built on the edges. A lot of it is zoned for sign family homes. Other laws around housing such as HB2001 allow to have lots split up for middle housing. It's forced us to change how we manage some of that data because of how we defined things in the past. Chair Kehe added this is related to policy, but it could be a debatable point. It could be partially market, too. It would be hard to look at just the recent time period. As noted, there are a couple policies that have changed during that time period.

Carol Chesarek asked does the data track affordable housing as well as those units included in the definitions of single and multi-mid-level? Mr. Mowbry noted do we have an affordable housing inventory? Were those affordable housing units included in this? In the numbers presented, yes. Ms. Chesarek added for a long time, developers argued against higher density requirements, using surveys showing most people preferred single family homes. They never seemed to ask whether those people would be able to afford those single-family homes.

Rachel Loftin noted it is also market conditions. It's really difficult to build even apartments for under \$350,000 per unit anymore. Single family homes are going for \$600k plus now. It's not a lot of people that can afford this, so it's what we can build vs what people can afford has just gotten so out of whack. Jerry Johnson agreed. Housing choices are a function of what households can afford, and that has shifted tenure and density over time.

Preston Korst noted I think it's a mixture of market and policy influenced impact—we see UGBs tending to drive density and multifamily rental development while driving costs on the land to build SFD for homeownership. Markets were also responding to 2010s demographic trends and lots of in-migration to Portland area, in addition to fairly cheap capital. Tom Armstrong added also demographics. A lot more 1- and 2-person households.

Joseph Edge noted I think it was helpful to see the difference in density that the multifamily on top of commercial is producing. My question relates to that. How many of our local jurisdictions even allow that amount of density of a hundred units an acre or more than a hundred? Your stat was three units an acre. How many jurisdictions even allow that kind of density on top of commercial anywhere in their limits? I'd like to see in that same breakout what the contribution of property tax revenue is by each of those land use types. Mr. Mowbry agreed the property tax revenue would be interesting to have but we'd need a policy person to supply that to the data. The data comes from all over the region not just the urban core. Others would have more insight on what the zoning allows but I do see it happening in the data all over the region.

**Urban Growth Management Decision: Regional housing needs analysis** (Ted Reid, Metro/ Becky Hewitt, ECO Northwest) Chair Kehe began the presentation with a review of the project timeline. The committee was reminded the Urban Growth Report (UGR) is a decision-making tool for the Metro Council, with today's presentation on the focus of land demand. To determine how much land will be demanded household characteristics were shown as part of the housing needs analysis. The housing needs analysis will include assessments of future and existing needs. New this cycle per statute is requiring a look at existing housing needs. In this analysis this is understood as housing needs for those experiencing houselessness and historic underproduction - what is the backlog of housing units to date?

Comments from the committee:

Manuel Contreras asked is the statute federal, state or Metro. Mr. Reid noted this is Oregon Statute. It's all part of our statewide planning system that describes how each city, and in our case, our region manages growth and manages their urban growth boundaries. In Metro's case we have the unique responsibility of looking at this question of growth management at least every six years. No other jurisdiction in the state has that responsibility. That's part of the work we do here.

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich asked if there would be information on how the recent legislation for the one-time UGB growth expansion requests ties into what Metro is doing. Mr. Reid noted we did not plan on discussing that day. It is a separate process that was added to the law this year that's outside of this six-year cycle. It's essentially if a city is adjacent to an urban reserve they can, under certain conditions petition Metro to add to that area to the urban growth boundary. But it's different than this six-year process that's based on a regional forecast, a regional housing needs analysis.

The presentation resumed with Becky Hewitt providing information on preliminary housing needs analysis (HNA) results. Regarding existing housing needs inside UGB, 18,000 homes from underproduction added to 12,300 homes for people experiencing houselessness will result in 30,300 additional homes needed today in total. Most existing needs are for lower incomes. The future housing needs methodology was described. The MSA (7 county) household forecast (household change 2024-2044) showed a low, baseline and high range. Analysis was provided on how much of the forecast growth in the MSA the Metro UGB will capture with these ranges.

MSA population forecast by age was reviewed. From 2024 to 2044, the millennial cohorts move into older age ranges while today's older households are also living longer, pushing the demographic "wave" into the older age groups. Net growth is in older households and more retirees will have lower incomes.

Comments from the committee:

Tom Armstrong asked what about vacation and 2nd homes in the existing housing stock? Mr. Reid noted statutes tell us to account for 2nd and vacation homes on the supply side (i.e., deduct from supply). Joseph Edge asked is it true that 2nd+vacation homes account for less than 1% of the total supply? Mr. Reid noted it is a small fraction. As I recall, you are correct that it is about 1%.

Carol Chesarek asked aren't cities who want to do that new off-cycle UGB expansion required to show there is a need for additional housing? Presumably need not met by UGB expansion? I think it would be helpful to explain how those rules compare to this process at some point in the next few months. Mr. Reid noted the new law for one-time expansions does require that cities meet certain criteria showing that they have used land in past expansions, haven't had an expansion in over 20 years, and that they have a housing cost burden. A bit different than the regional need that we have to establish in this 6-year process.

Comments from the committee:

Sarah Radcliffe asked can you explain the drop in households with kids? Curious since all other household types have some growth. Is that just because birth rates are down, existing kids age out and new younger families are not forming or moving here? Mr. Reid noted we do expect there will be families with kids. It's simply that as the population ages the large millennium generation today, as they age, they're not replaced by the subsequent generation in the same numbers. That's why it's showing us a net decrease. Natasha Garcia noted this pairs with our studies at Portland Public Schools with our declining enrollment, and a lot of that is low birth rates.

Glen Bolen noted retirement communities with high rent but coming with many conveniences and amenities. Is that a market sector that we can expect? Is growth expected here? Ms. Hewitt noted this was a good segue in the presentation to discuss what we think this means for housing needs going forward. If this is what our demographic trajectory looks like does it mean we need more assisted living and senior housing. Does it mean we need more attached housing. Does it mean we need more single detached housing. What do we take from this and what do we need.

Rachel Loftin asked are you taking into account where in the past 15 or so years there's been this trend where empty nesters are not actually relocating out of their sizeable homes. They're staying in them until their seventies plus rather than downsizing. Ms. Hewitt notes this is where we go next in discussions. This is a really important driver of what our future needs look like going forward.

Resuming the presentation, Ms. Hewitt provided the housing demand model overview. The demand methodology combines forecasts of households by socioeconomic characteristics (from Metro) with factors impacting housing choice to estimate housing need by housing typology. These factors include:

1. Household life stage: Households by age, size, and presence of kids
2. Tenure split: Propensity to Rent/Own by life stage characteristic
3. Ability to pay: Share of income spent on housing varies by income and tenure
4. Housing Choice: Distribution of households by housing type

Housing demand scenarios was shown. Following in footsteps: Housing choices at each life-stage remain constant – as current households age, their housing choices look the same as those of older households today. *More single-unit detached housing*

Fundamental shifts: Housing choices shift substantially towards attached housing based on affordability. *More middle housing and multifamily*

New normal: As households age, their housing choices shift towards those of older households today, but not to same extent.

The housing choice mix combined with the housing type and prices produced a forecast future need by housing type. Total Additional Housing Units Needed in Metro UGB 2024-2044 results in:

High Growth Scenario: 290,100 future needs

Baseline Growth Scenario: 179,900 future needs

Low Growth Scenario: 87,600 future needs

Comments from the committee:

Steve Koper noted not specific to Portland, but I came across this article recently suggesting many older homeowners are hanging onto their homes: <https://www.businessinsider.com/baby-boomers-millennials-large-homes-inventory-affordability-election-2024-4>

Jerry Johnson noted ability to pay is less linked to income for retired households, who have often accumulated significant wealth but have relatively low incomes. Tom Armstrong noted we have a huge cohort of households that have little to no retirement savings and will need housing that is affordable on Social Security. Mr. Johnson noted meeting the demand for the cohort Mr. Armstrong talks about would require a significant commitment to public investment. Dennis Yee added if you are retired and have minimal income because one is retired but have a house paid off, why would you rent or move if you can age in place more cheaply. The ones that don't have the accumulated housing wealth already, they are likely renters already and will continue to do so.

Joseph Edge asked what is the mix of housing types in other cities? Historically, haven't we built detached housing at higher rates than other metros? Anecdotally, many people I know that move here from other cities are more comfortable with attached housing (townhouses, rowhouses) than our historic housing mix would suggest. Ted Reid posted a link in chat that has an article on this topic with some comparisons. <https://streets.mn/2015/12/15/chart-of-the-day-housing-types-for-different-us-cities/> I think we can say that the share of single-family housing varies considerable from city to city. Portland seems to be in the upper end of the spectrum.

Tom Armstrong asked are those cities or regions. Ms. Hewitt noted just based on the numbers my guess would be those are cities. Mr. Armstrong agreed which makes a huge difference because some city boundaries are extremely tight and only include the urban areas. And some like San Antonio include the entire metro area. Jerry Johnson noted reduced housing sizes is one of the only market responses we have. Mr. Armstrong added Portland has limited new detached SFR to 2,500sf as part of our middle housing changes. Makes middle housing more competitive for land and makes new SFR slightly less expensive. Ms. Hewitt added lower cost per square foot for older homes is not terribly surprising — the large older homes are probably more affordable than large new homes in many cases. Fiona Lyon added a link to another interesting article on the topic:

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2024/03/10/smaller-new-houses-affordable/?crl8\\_id=71ea1ef8-d65e-4ff3-b687-0a782bb5ad20](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2024/03/10/smaller-new-houses-affordable/?crl8_id=71ea1ef8-d65e-4ff3-b687-0a782bb5ad20)

Answering concerns on low to high housing types and costs, Ms. Hewitt noted we've been trying to adjust the model to account for the fact that the shifts in housing would affect not just our net new households, but all households. These charts don't fully reflect this. But what it does show in reference to distribution by income, that if a lot of our growth is in lower incomes those segments are a lot of older single person households. Noting a good number of them do have other assets of wealth. What is affordable to them is harder to predict based on income. Renter housing will be affected by age and income as well.

Nina Carlson asked do you forecast any changes in technology? Because we know with living wage and community benefit agreements, we are not going to see wages come down for construction. It's going to get more expensive for the people who build the product. And over time we have seen the costs of material going up. As housing ages, we find it is more cost effective to tear down old housing and build new modern housing that's more efficient and can be live in more affordably and maybe more suited to the way people live. I don't see any cost drivers coming down to bring new homes to market. Technology is the only thing I could see where we're mass producing like container type homes that are less expensive.

Becky Hewitt noted this part is focused on the demand side. I think the cost of production shows up more on the supply side and redevelopment. It's hard to say over 20 years whether any of the things that are in beta experimentation mode right now will move to the point where they are more cost effective as opposed to, we think we can get there if we ramp up production. I would agree right now that the modular housing, mass timber things like that people have hoped would bring the cost of production down those technologies are not there right now and it's hard to say whether they will be or not.

Jerry Johnson noted this is the inherent problem we come into with the three-body issue as well where you've got interest rates, construction costs and incomes or ability to pay trying to make that work so you actually get development to occur. The problems we have in the market as we hit these points where nothing works, there's potential for maybe some solution in the future, but it's hard to plan on that. Hopefully they'll be some technological innovation that will make this somewhat easier.

If you look at the demand curves shown, most of that is what the market cannot respond to. But we're showing demand for it. If we could, we would have no problem leasing those but the market's not going to be able to solve that problem. So, in reality we've got a demand side and a supply side and it's a reconciliation where you have to go back and forth, here's what the market wants, here's what the market can supply, how do we resolve that? The resolution is rarely optimal. Right now, they're separate equations. A lot on the production side are difficult because the profile of demand really can't be dealt with by profile of what the market can actually produce.

Al Mowbry noted we've seen in the data that there are plenty of reasons why housing prices have been going up, but one additional one is that we are building newer bigger homes. Our data from 1980 show the average size of a house was 1700 square feet. It's gone up to roughly 2600 square feet in 2018. We're building bigger houses which are also more expensive. One issue we're discussing is are we going to see in the data, as pressure builds to make more affordable housing, well we see houses get smaller again? And maybe not in the single family lot size. But again, with middle housing types made available that may be an avenue to provide options for people to buy something, even if it's only 800 square feet. That's debatable if it's appealing to certain demographics. But a possible avenue toward homeownership.

Ms. Hewitt added that's why our fundamental shift has such a big increase in the middle housing, basically assuming a substitution between single detached housing and middle housing as a way to get some of the things you might want out of a single detached home, but at a more affordable price point.

Rachel Loftin noted reference to the square footage for average size homes in the past, was there data readily available for that? When looking for a house 10 years back we looked at mid-century homes because comparison wise, we were finding more square footage within that range than we found within new construction that wasn't luxury. Mr. Mowbry noted our data source for that is the tax lot data for the Tri-County area. The average size of a house built in 2020 has been increasing the size built over time. Additions to homes have increase sizes. It's looking at the current tax lot square footage assessment and the year it was built. In theory they should be assessing for taxes on any expansions that have been made as well.

*Meeting break taken*

**Small Site Industrial Readiness Toolkit: Increasing the availability of small industrial spaces across the region** (David Tetrick, Metro) Building on past project, we have begun a new iteration of the Industrial Readiness Toolkit taking the project in a new direction and focus on small industrial sites. For context, large industrial sites are typically 100,000 square feet and larger, occupying a site of at least five acres. Small industrial sites are typically less than 30,000 square feet and as small as a half-acre. A healthy industrial ecosystem will have a variety of sizes of industrial spaces available to allow for businesses to start and grow.

The presentation provided information on how large industrial inventory is growing fastest and vacancy is persistently low, particularly at small industrial properties. Project results are showing a shortage of small industrial spaces disproportionately impacts minority and women entrepreneurs. The need for small industrial spaces is both equity imperative and market needed. Development issues that inhibit widespread new small industrial was described. A list of tools to support small industrial was shown. Metro's role with what industrial users need and what cities want was presented.

Comments from the committee:

Bruce Coleman asked are other regions having more success with providing such small industrial projects and if so, what tools are they using? Mr. Tetrick noted unfortunately we didn't have the time in this project to really undertake that regional analysis. We've had that same question, are other regions also seeing a shortfall in small industrial site development because of the same market factors are at play. You are going to have fewer capital investments and others from large lenders. Some of those same dynamics are going to be at play everywhere in the country.

Kelly Reid asked did you find that commercial spaces, such as empty big box stores, are suitable for some types of small industrial uses? What are the barriers to that? Mr. Tetrick noted we did find that some commercial spaces would be well suited for some types of industrial development. A lot of times the barriers are going to be twofold. One is the zoning. Whether a local jurisdiction allows that type of industrial use in a currently commercial or previously commercial zone. We're seeing more kinds of allowance for commercial uses in industrial zones and we're losing some industrial capacity as a result of that. But we're not seeing that trend go the other way just yet.

In cases where cities and counties do allow that, the barrier is usually going to be the construction itself. So, does it have a sufficiently strong pad built underneath it to allow for heavier machinery?



That's going to be very specific to any particular development. There are a lot of industrial uses that could go on a commercial pad, but there are some that are going to need more racking, more heavy equipment and it won't function as well. Small commercial may need sufficient retrofit or reconstruction to be able to switch over to an industrial use.

Joseph Edge reflected on our community's experience with this subject. Back in 2017 we started to advocate to the county to legalize small scale manufacturing in community commercial zones and corridor commercial zones. There was a specific clause that there was no manufacturing of raw materials, the technicality that was keeping us from seeing bakeries and brew pubs. Through persistent advocacy we were able to get the county to legalize edible manufacturing in our commercial zones. But it requires a retail component in order for that to occur. I think that mostly applies just to the edibles manufacturing.

But then if you look at what Milwaukie is doing in their mixed use in commercial zones they're allowing similar small scale manufacturing when there's a retail component, but not just with edibles. I'm glad to see that we're following up on this as a region because we haven't seen a lot of success. What can we do to draw in more of these small-scale manufacturing uses. Is the retail component essential? We want these jobs here, we want these uses here, but we also want them in a placemaking sense. In Oak Grove we have about a 60-acre area zoned for light industrial with pressure from adjacent businesses to consume part of this. What can we do to bring jobs producing uses to these lands that are in a sense already built out but not productive in the way we want in the community and region.

Mr. Tetrick noted the requirement of a commercial component is an interesting way to weed out certain other users. I could see it as being good for a certain activation and we definitely have a strong regional advantage in food and beverage manufacturing. I think it could be challenging if there is a method where jurisdictions can allow for a variance for certain light industrial in that commercial zone for instance, or that mixed-use zone. I think it makes sense to talk early about setting guidelines on when that would be utilized and ways around attracting employers who will provide street activation where necessary. An example of Happy Valley was provided, driven by the infrastructure capacity of that particular industrial area or those industrial lots. From a longer-term strategic perspective you can try to attract industry with significant property tax able to pay for improvements needed to make a higher value industrial area for other users. More infrastructure can be built out and attract more job focused users.

Glen Bolen noted I feel this is an area where very few people understand the dynamics. There is some understand of supply and demand with housing, not so much industrial. City Councils may talk about creating small site industrial. There's the other side of this in defense of this where industrial is the lower rent and when things are slow the option to rent to employers catering to children's activities and less safety infrastructure can cause challenges. As a suggestion some of this could be included in your report that Metro publishes and gets shared. There may be some defensive tools that could apply as well. It was noted the City of Hillsboro uses urban renewal to make site ready for industry. That's an option city has. Another that Hillsboro does is when they're doing their industrial development, they limit the amount of non-industrial space. It's contingent on number of employees and square feet developed. Mr. Tetrick agreed there is a lot of conversation to be had about that. We definitely heard about that loss of small industrial space over time, due to gentrification of those areas and the shift in use when a market turndown happens, or business exits, and a landlord has an opportunity.

Bret Marchant noted this trend certainly echo a lot of what we're hearing with the work we do with our partners across the region at the state level. As a follow up or a potential follow up study, the Metro commodities movement study identified an update to the regional land use inventory, industrial land use inventory as something that might be happening. I was wondering if you had any additional information on the timeline of that. I think that could help compliment this work.

Tim Collins noted we have a placeholder in the Unified Planning Work Program for this study. We haven't completely defined everything in there. This presentation was very helpful for to help fashion what that scope might be to help fill in some of the things that we don't know yet. The intent of that study would be primarily looking at the need for more accessibility, more readiness for some of the larger industrial sites around the region. Particularly those that could handle larger distribution sites and fulfillment centers. I think these two things would dovetail well together with looking at the smaller industrial sites with this study, and the coordinating it with the next study that looks at larger sites.

Mr. Tetrick added after presenting this work to Metro Council we had feedback for us to continue to engage in those site development roadmaps on behalf of jurisdictions. This would be something outside of the 2040 Planning and Development grant process, but we can ratify assistance through there as well. We have an industrial land readiness category for that. Mr. Tetrick shared his email for further questions or comments.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:37 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting April 17, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	4/17/2024	4/17/2024 MTAC Meeting Agenda	041724M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	4/9/2024	MTAC Work Program as of 4/9/2024	041724M-02
3	Minutes	3/20/2024	Draft minutes from MTAC March 20, 2024 meeting	041724M-03
4	Presentation	4/17/2024	Small Site Industrial Readiness	041724M-04
5	Presentation	4/17/2024	Historic residential development trends	041724M-05
6	Presentation	4/17/2024	Urban growth management: Preliminary Housing Needs Analysis results	041724M-06