



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, May 15, 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
Dan Dias
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich
Anna Slatinsky
Laura Terway
Steve Koper
Adam Barber
Gery Keck
Bret Marchant
Mary Kyle McCurdy
Preston Korst
Erik Cole
Mike O'Brien

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County Community Member
Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Largest City in the Region: Portland
Largest City in Washington County: Hillsboro
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin
Multnomah County
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Greater Portland, Inc.
1000 Friends of Oregon
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Schnitzer Properties, Inc./ Revitalize Portland Coalition
Mayer/Reed, Inc.

Alternate Members Attending

Kamran Mesbah
Vee Paykar
Faun Hosey
Mary Phillips
Ashley Miller
Dan Rutzick
Dakota Meyer
Miranda Bateschell
Martha Fritzie
Theresa Cherniak
Glen Bolen
Kelly Reid
Chris Faulkner
Fiona Lyon
Jerry Johnson
Jeff Hampton
Aaron Golub
Kerry Steinmetz
Craig Sheahan
Ryan Ames

Affiliate

Clackamas County Community Member
Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Largest City in Multnomah County: Gresham
Largest City in Multnomah County: Gresham
Largest City in Washington County: City of Hillsboro
City of Troutdale
City of Wilsonville
Clackamas County
Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Dev.
Clean Water Services
TriMet
Johnson Economics, LLC
Business Oregon
Portland State University
Fidelity National Title Greater Metropolitan Portland
David Evans & Associations, Inc.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington County

Leah Fisher

Public Health & Urban Forum, Clackamas County

Guests Attending

Brandon Schrader
Eric Rutledge
Jan Frutiger Tysoe
Jeff Kleinman
Jena Hughes
Josh Lehner
Justin Sherrill
Kevin Young
Marc Farrar
Megan Bolton
Michael Veale
Mike Wilkerson
Paul Delsman
Sean Edging

Affiliate

OHCS (OR Housing & Community Services)
City of Sherwood
City of King City
Attorney
OR Department of Land Conservation & Development
OR Office of Economic Analysis
ECONorthwest
OR Department of Land Conservation & Development
Metropolitan Land Group, LLC
OHCS

ECONorthwest
Howard S. Wright
OR Department of Land Conservation & Development

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Chris Pence, Clint Chiavarini, Eryn Kehe, Jake Lovell, Lakeeyscia Griffin, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Ted Reid

Call to Order, Quorum Declaration and Introductions

Chair Eryn Kehe called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was declared. Introductions were made.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Chair Kehe announced that hybrid committee meetings were being planned to start at the MTAC September meeting. Metro is continuing to upgrade technology in the Metro Council Chambers. It is expected to be ready with staff trained by September when MTAC is scheduled to discuss and make a recommendation to MPAC on the Urban Growth Boundary decision. Online attendance will be available as well.

Adam Barber announced that Multnomah County is looking for their next Planning Director. He would be happy to answer questions and provide further information.

Glen Bolen noted some road closures.

1. 4 miles of I-5 will close in SW Portland for a weekend June 28 to July 1 to replace a bridge over SW 26th Ave.
2. OR 217 will see overnight directional closures for the Hall Blvd bridge construction.
3. US 26 will also see overnight directional closures between Corn Pass and Brookwood for paving

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none given.

Consideration of MTAC minutes April 17, 2024 meeting

The minutes were not available in time for the packet mailing. They will be presented at the June 26, 2024 meeting.

Urban Growth Boundary Decision: City UGB expansion proposal (Ted Reid, Metro & Eric Rutledge, City of Sherwood) Ted Reid noted over the last several months we've been bringing topics related to our analysis of whether there's a need to expand the urban growth boundary. We've brought forward the capacity side and demand side. The other piece of this is city readiness. We have a process in our growth management decisions intended to be responsive to city proposals for expansions into urban reserves. We received a proposal in this decision cycle from the City of Sherwood. This is for the Sherwood West Urban Reserve area.

Eric Rutledge presented the Sherwood West Concept plan. The presentation included housing and employment needs, the planning and engagement process that went into the plan, and land use alternatives. Planning with the METRO URBAN GROWTH MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONAL PLAN elements was reviewed. The recommended and accepted concept plan included diverse land uses, connected transportation systems and ample parks, trains and open space. Housing estimates and employment land uses were discussed. Planned transportation and park and trail networks were reviewed. Infrastructure and development readiness was discussed.

Comments from the committee:

Joseph Edge asked about middle housing in specific districts. Our definition of middle housing includes town houses, which tend to be a traditional type we're already seeing, but perhaps not as extensive as the plexes that we might hope to see coming out of HB2001. How are you handling town homes in those middle housing zones? I know the cottage cluster zone is exclusive to that type, but for the other middle housing zones how are you planning to handle town homes to make sure that we're getting the intensity that you're hoping to see there.

Mr. Rutledge noted town homes would be permitted with the middle housing zone. It's going to come down to how we approach the master planning. A lot of details are yet to be worked out. Town homes was one of the preferred middle housing types for Sherwood. We will be working with developers and other planners in the private sector what will work here when we get into that more detail. We're going to look at both urban design and feasibility and try to locate middle housing types at appropriate locations within those zones. We are looking at SDC incentives and other incentives to try to make sure that our middle housing zone can be implemented.

Faun Hosey asked how did you go about involving the owners of properties in and beyond the expansion area? Do you have rural CPOs or farming groups weighing in? Mr. Rutledge noted we engaged the property owners within Sherwood West proper and then also the even larger property owners with the rural reserve. We held an open house and did a survey. We asked property owners with Sherwood West if they were supportive of the plan and 70-80% of respondents in the survey agreed. We got into detail with them on land uses and discussed alternatives. There was a lot of input. I wouldn't say that some opposition from rural landowners may occur. But we fully engaged with property owners within Sherwood West. It was noted a lot of informal engagement after the plan was developed to start developing of the vision in the hospitality district area. This includes small and large vineyards that could serve rural land uses and business owners outside of the boundary.

Joseph Edge asked if there was an example of anybody that you're planning to model about the hospitality district after in terms of the allowed uses. Mr. Rutledge noted it's still very early stage. We are going to go to Woodinville, WA where it seems they've been successful in crafting that urban wine destination place that also leans into the local wineries. There are also good examples within the Willamette Valley itself, which includes event spaces, wine tasting rooms and lodging. We have a lot of

ideas, but the key is how do we blend the urbanization of this area and provide a destination that leans into the wine space.

Joseph Edge asked if you have contemplated things like minimum lot sizes that you might shoot for in that area. You mentioned boutique hotels so it sounds like you might be looking for smaller, more diversified development than just one big resort, for example. Mr. Rutledge agreed. We are looking more in the smaller scale size. The property parcelization there right now is conducive to being flexible to development. They are relatively large lots; 15 acres average in the area. It's likely we will master plan this area as well. It's not too parceled and it's not owned by just one person. Generally speaking, smaller scale as opposed to larger format.

Mr. Edge asked would production space need to be accessory to some other tourism kind of use. Would that maybe be able to stand alone as a primary use. Mr. Rutledge noted I think we'll have to get into it with the Metro code and our own comprehensive plan. It could be either at this point. The only concern would be is this a commercial district. Is this industrial. If there's some production going on, how do we craft a code that is flexible but also complies with all of our regional code requirements.

Chair Kehe noted concept planning is a very early form of planning that occurs before an area is brought into the growth boundary or before specific zones are identified for it. The next step, if an area is brought into the growth boundary, Metro provides funding for comprehensive planning. The next big stage is a more detailed level of planning. And then zoning code is usually produced out of that effort.

Jerry Johnson shared comments in the chat. I am glad you mentioned that employment uses are typically more compatible with agriculture than residential. We are working on a similar concept (in hospitality) for a private developer in Southern Oregon. It would include a custom crush facility as well as tasting rooms and restaurants.

Dan Dias had a question on the urban growth report work. As we're giving input and working with Metro, responding to the employment and residential capacity numbers, looking at the forecast information, Metro has really looked for the next 20 years by leaning on others amongst others from an expert panel that was convened last January. It was mentioned there are specific state requirements of who can be included in that expert panel, that it involves demographers and economists. It's fairly limited who can participate on that panel. Can you elaborate on that a little bit?

Ted Reid noted it's not so much specific direction for who can be on our expert panel review for our forecast. The laws don't tell us to convene that kind of group. It's more about the sorts of practices that we're required to use as we're conducting our forecasts, relying on practices that are commonly accepted by economists and demographers, and objective verifiable data. That's the guidance that we have. We could send you a copy of that part of the statute if that's helpful.

Mr. Reid added we convened an expert panel to review our regional forecast with state employment offices, and regional economists and demographers. The group looked at our forecast results and found them to be reasonable, consistent with the forecast that PSU is coming out with for population, consistent with employment forecast that the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis is coming out with. That's what we're looking for, is not be an outlier in this work.

15-minute meeting break taken

Oregon Housing Needs Analysis (OHNA) methodology in the Metro area (Josh Lehner, OR Office of Economic Analysis, Sean Edging, DLCD, Mike Wilkerson, ECONorthwest) Sean Edging, Senior Housing Planner with DLCD began the presentation. Policy background was provided. The OHNA represents the most significant revision to the state’s housing planning system since its inception 50 years ago. The entire state is experiencing a housing crisis. Prior to the OHNA, Oregon’s housing planning system planned for and invested in too little housing resulting in undersupply, rising home prices, segregation and displacement in some communities, and deepening inequities across all communities.

The OHNA has been under development for several years. In 2019, House Bill 2003 directed OHCS to study a pilot methodology, which was completed in 2020. Under subsequent direction from the legislature, OHCS and DLCD refined the methodology in 2022 to better account for specific functions and components. The Office of Economic Analysis at DAS will be finalizing the OHNA methodology throughout 2024 so it can be run on January 1, 2025.

Goal 10 – Housing under OHNA was described. OHNA replaces localized projections with state estimate/allocation; local gov’ts make policy choices. The components of housing need began with a pilot program of three: population growth, underproduction, and housing for the homeless. The current methodology added two more components: second and vacation homes, and demographic change. Statewide and regional targets were explained.

- Policy objective is to prioritize and front load the current need as a 10-year target
- 78k units statewide of current need = 7,800 units per year
- Remaining future need of 503k is distributed over 20 years, for a target of 25k a year

In order to help produce regional and local allocation estimates that do not jump around from year to year, the regional totals are expected to be smoothed using the past few years of data. This is challenging currently due to the change in PUMA regions in 2022 as well as 2020 data not being available due to unreliability. Options will be explored and refined once the first statewide official total is produced using 2023 data.

Allocating Regional Need to Urban Growth Boundaries and Cities inside Metro:

Step 1. Regional Need Inside vs. Outside UGBs

1. Future population growth outside of UGBs is determined for each of the regions over 20 years
2. Units are removed for population growth, demographic change, and 2nd and vacation homes from the regional total
3. The remaining units are then allocated to UGBs inside the region

Step 2. Distributing Regional Need to UGBs

Each component of need is allocated from the regional total (after excluding areas outside of UGBs) to each of the UGBs in the region using a set of policy variables and weights.

Allocating from Metro UGB to Cities: Metro will have its own methodology to distribute units from the UGB to cities and unincorporated areas.

Step 3- Unincorporated areas within Metro UGB

The total UGB units (by income) are then allocated to the unincorporated areas of each county based on their current share of housing units (18% of UGB), the remaining units are allocated to cities within the Metro UGB.

Comments from the committee:

Martha Fritzie noted that several of us just went through this long process and work group to specifically define urban unincorporated county areas. My understanding is that was for the purpose of this allocation, and that housing would be allocated based on urban unincorporated areas, not simply unincorporated land within the urban growth boundary, or the percentage of housing on unincorporated lands generally within the UGB. Is that not true or is that what's happening here and you just didn't want to get into that nuance. Mr. Lehner noted I think it's both, where I believe this specific calculation, the full 18% is total housing units on all unincorporated land within the UGB. But the issue of the urban piece is something that we've been discussing. The way this is currently working is the allocation total just goes to the county, not to a specific area of the county.

Ms. Fritzie noted her concern that if the allocation total is based on this assumption that there's a whole bunch more land available. Because it's based on lands that haven't annexed into cities. Then it could potentially create a problem for us. Because there are areas that may look like they're available and have capacity, but there are areas that the county will not be urbanizing that the cities are urbanizing. The concern is we don't want to be given an allocation that we clearly can't meet and then somehow get ourselves into trouble on the back end and be put into programs for bad players. Mr. Lehner noted the expansion areas are inside the UGB. But yes, I think that's a key point. And again, as to the extent that they are unincorporated lands that are fully expected to be annexed into jurisdictions in the years to come, this number will shrink, and the city numbers will grow. The total need would be the same, in theory, but the exact allocations would be adjusted based upon what's happening with land use and development patterns.

The presentation resumed discussing Metro's uniqueness with Step 4: Allocate Units to Cities.

Areas of concern using statewide allocation methodology:

- Metro forecast is development capacity constrained
- Are jobs in a city the best measure for prioritizing housing location at the city scale?
- Do cities get "credit" for historically producing above average amounts of housing?
- Is there some measure of "corrective action" for cities that have not produced sufficient amounts of affordable housing in the past

Allocating Current Need (11% of total)

50% Weight – Housing Production- "Credit for previous production"

- Production is the average share of permits issued over last 5 years (2018 to 2022) as a percentage of the current stock for all of the cities in the UGB
- Each city below the Metro average share of productions receives its weight of the "deficit of units" compared to the UGB

50% Weight – Housing Affordability – "Corrective action"

- Affordability measures the number of rental units affordable to households earning 50% or less of AMI (CHAS) as a share of the total stock (ACS)
- Each city below the Metro average share of affordable units receives its weight of the "deficit of units" compared to the UGB

Examples of this method of allocation for affordability or production for current need was given.

Allocating Future Need to Cities was discussed. Measuring access to jobs via walk/transit in 60 minutes was described with graphics and examples. City Allocations within Metro covered a range of outcomes based on component parts. The impact of achieving target over 20 years on the distribution of affordability was shown. The committee was reminded of the timeline for the methodology with

webinars, public comment period and meetings and Public Testimony on Draft Methodology before DAS publishes documentation for Final Methodology at the end of the year.

Comments from the committee:

Kevin Young asked for confirmation that Metro's work as discussed here, will not pertain to cities outside the Metro UGB, but within Washington and Clackamas Counties. Sean Edging noted cities outside of the Metro would be subject to the statewide process and not the Metro process.

Theresa Cherniak asked so will those cities outside that area (e.g., Banks, North Plains, Gaston) get their own goals? Justin Sherrill noted they receive their own targets using the standard statewide methodology. Sean Edging added all cities will receive an allocation of 20-year need. While cities within the Metro will receive an allocation based on the total estimated by Metro, cities outside of the Metro UGB will receive an allocation based on the tri-county need (similar to how other regions in the state function). Cities above 10,000 and Metro UUAs will also receive a housing production target (i.e. a 'goal') based on that 20-year allocation.

Jerry Johnson asked is there a more detailed methodological write up available yet. It is quite interesting, but it will take time and more information to evaluate. Sean Edging noted a detailed Interim Methodology will be published in June and public comment will open for 30 days. You can sign up for updates on OHCS webpage - <https://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/about-us/pages/housing-needs.aspx> Megan Bolton noted the original technical report on the pilot methodology is here: <https://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/about-us/Documents/RHNA%20and%20OHNA/2020-RHNA-Technical-Report-Final.pdf>

Kevin Young asked to confirm no allocation of housing to Clark County or other areas on the Washington side? Mike Wilkerson confirmed this.

Miranda Bateschell asked are you considering only TriMet? Or did you also include SMART? Glen Bolen noted it seems there is a bit of chicken/egg relationship there - if you lower the target for locations without good transit, won't it be less likely those areas will build transit supportive densities? Jerry Johnson noted the access approach appears to heavily favor transit over other options. I believe transit trips represent about 6.5% of commuting in the Portland metro area. Clint Chiavarini asked does the transit access measure take into account non-TriMet providers? I'm surprised that Wilsonville is so low considering SMART. Justin Sherrill noted the model includes SMART and TriMet. Fiona Lyon noted TriMet's pedestrian plan looked at and gathered all of the sidewalk gaps in the region. It's a few years old at this point but might be good data to pull into this methodology if it's truly employment access by transit + walking.

Miranda Bateschell noted questions related to Ms. Fritzie's questions to the work that was done on the urban unincorporated areas. During that conversation there were two different areas that were defined. The urban unincorporated areas as well as the urban useable unincorporated areas. The urban useable being essentially those areas brought into the UGB by Metro, per a city's request because the city has already done concept planning for them and is prepared to do the planning and development of those areas. They are in the UGB, but they are not annexed to a city yet. So having the methodology be based on city annexation could be problematic because then we'd be allocating essentially housing to counties who aren't prepared to plan for those number of units. Whereas cities already have a plan and probably a target for those areas when they're brought into the UGB.

For example, in 2018 the UGB amendment that brought in Frog Pond, that area is being planned by the city. That area will annex, as development occurs, not as one giant annexation. You wouldn't say that's annexed as soon as it comes to the UGB. All 1800 of those units are attributed to the city, based on the way I heard that methodology, it would actually be looking at allocating those units to the county, because they aren't annexed to a city. So I think that the methodology should account for that, that if the area is brought into the UGB, it's planned for by a city. We're not attributing that to the county.

Mr. Lehner noted when thinking of this, if it's just land and it hasn't been developed yet and we're using PSU forecast for areas outside of UGB, as one of it, then that has not impact, unless PSU's forecast explicitly says this land that's undeveloped today is going to be brought into the UGB, we're going to account for that in the UGB population forecast. That's the key linkage there. We have to double check on that. The other one is to the extent that it's getting allocated to the county and it ultimately becomes city's production. There might be some timing mismatch. We're updating this every single year. When it comes to the other stages of the housing needs analysis program, more broadly with OHCS and DLCD, when we talk about progress toward the target it's like we got allocated these thousand acres that's actually city land, not county land. That's another key point here from the upfront methodology perspective.

Ms. Bateschell noted she didn't think PSU is projecting population forecast for the UGB areas. And if it is it would probably be underestimating production because it would be annexed as, or it would be looking as if it's county land. I'm concerned about it because typically when we're going through the urban growth report and the forecast, we're looking at what the zoning is. For things like Frog Pond, we're not looking at the existing county zoning to make a determination on what the projected growth is in the areas. We're looking at what will the city zoning be that's being put on that land, and what is essentially the population we can forecast for that area. Because if you looked at Frog Pond based on Clackamas County zoning, we would have very few housing units. When we're working with Metro, looking at the UGR and looking at numbers and sharing with them what we're going to be zoning, which is going to be 1800 units. There's a vast difference in terms of the land capacity if you're attributing it to county vs attributing it as urban growth boundary amendment area that's being planned for by a city.

Mr. Lehner noted here we're talking about allocating the total regional need to the individual jurisdictions. You're talking about the actual development capacity of a given piece of land, which is going to fall under the zoning and the housing production strategies and other pieces of the overall process. They're very important but that's not part of this allocation of the regional need, what is this specific parcel of lands production capabilities going from regional to local need. Ms. Bateschell thought it's relevant on both ends because if that's land that we're planning for and units that would be in the overall capacity, that should also be a part of our allocation and not part of the county's allocation.

Joseph Edge noted questions around the unincorporated county allocations but with respect to the legacy of unincorporated areas that were urbanized before 1980. If you're leaving it to the county to decide where they're going to allocate growth, what's to stop the county from targeting growth in pockets outside Lake Oswego or Happy Valley or whatever, instead of targeting along McLoughlin corridor where there are growth opportunities, an existing infrastructure to support it. It seems that would be a logical place to target and that there should be access to jobs via transit. This seems like the intuitive place to focus some of the growth. But then you say you're just leaving it to the county. Just trying to reconcile that information with that slide. It's the same at the city level. The city gets an

allocation but they city can reach that target or that allocation however they choose. Within their jurisdiction. Same thing at the county level when you get the total and then it's up to the local planning decisions and processes to determine where and how and what production strategies you have.

Vee Paykar noted as a non-planner I had a question on how much Metro incorporates repurposing existing buildings for housing stock into the calculation or thinking of what Metro does. Is Metro allowing for more dense building through ADUs or other kinds of alternative methods instead of new construction. Chair Kehe noted what the main topic that's talked about here is about demand for housing and the number of people and where they'll go. The second part is how do we accommodate those people. What land do we need. What density of housing and how is that addressed in cities that are all required by the same legislation to produce housing production strategies, and Metro will produce a housing coordination strategy. All of those plans are the place to talk about once you have that need and you know what the number of people you need to accommodate for number of households to accommodate. Planning those processes are specific to having conversations about how to accommodate those numbers.

Glen Bolen asked who's the enforcement arm of this and which state agencies have coordinating agreements. For ODOT, we have an agreement that we'd specify what is and is not land use action with the idea we are supposed to be supporting local cities' comprehensive plans. What if a city with their comprehensive plans creates more density in places so that they can get transit service, create a mix of uses. But if their target doesn't reflect that, that might lead support to their opponents of growth. Perhaps even the state doesn't want us to grow there. General services say they don't have land use actions or effect land use. To make this solid in the long run I think that's a bridge might be due to cross.

Mr. Lehner noted on the second piece there we'll be doing these allocations; these estimates every year. Cities will get locked into the six- or eight-year cycle, but to the extent that transit access does change, then all these numbers will be updated, too. It's dynamic in that sense so that it's based upon current patterns. If TriMet puts in a new light rail line, it's going to change those numbers accordingly. There is that feedback effect to it.

Mr. Edging added there's multiple layers to the piece that is raised here. First off, I think it's important to recognize that the overall policy for the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis fundamentally requires us to change from planning for a status quo that led us here. A lot of the rulemaking process that we're underway with right now is about how do we orient Goal 10 around this idea that not only are we planning just for capacity, or accommodating capacity, but we're trying to specifically proactively and affirmatively adopt policies that facilitate housing production, affordability and choice. And a lot of parts of this relate back to pieces on allowing a greater diversity of housing choices in our neighborhoods. And there's an intersection with the methodology, but I think it's important to recognize every community is going to be planning for more housing, especially affordable housing, which we have historically not built enough of.

You mentioned accountability. I think part of the policy does recognize specifically what that looks like, and that's part of the rulemaking discussion around the housing acceleration program. Specifically how DLCD interacts with local governments in response to tracking progress towards outcomes and how we set up that process. Mr. Bolen noted I was addressing who was responsible for administration for the implementation of Goal 10 with collaboration with partners and local governments. Mr. Edging confirmed DLCD is the responsible administrator and where policy implications are part of the dynamic.

Theresa Cherniak noted you were talking about assigning future growth to areas outside of the UGB and allocating future needs there. Areas outside of the UGB for us is the rural area. Are you saying that you are assigning housing need for a rural area and are we going to need to step up production of housing in the rural area, which is not where it's about housing. It's supposed to be about protection of resources and farm and forest and all that. Housing happens, but it's not like we're not really pushing it to happen there.

Mr. Lehner noted that is based on the PSU population forecast. They do have population forecast for areas outside of UGB for all other counties. But it's not really robust growth in most cases. So that would be the piece that is assigned the future need based upon the population forecast. The underproduction and housing for homelessness is assigned specifically to the UGBs. Mr. Edging noted from a policy perspective you can think of it as neutral, essentially acknowledging that some growth does happen outside of PSU's forecast. When we have this total need we can essentially reduce some of that, acknowledging that there's this expectation for some degree of population growth but it's generally limited. Because state policy does not facilitate significant housing production outside of urban growth boundaries.

Fiona Lyon asked where the 60-minute metric comes from, related to the transit in the methodology. Mr. Lehner noted that is a number that could change in the methodology. That would be something you could provide, comment on if you want, but it's trying to get at that nexus of infrastructure and accessibility and where people live. That's probably for planning purposes for the further fair housing. That is what we're going for. How do you get there based on currently available data. We looked at reasonableness, thresholds of transit access and job accessibility as a good data way to get to what we care about. Setting those thresholds so it's not too restrictive and reasonable. It's trying to thread that needle on what we care about, what the legislative intent is and data availability.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:36 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting May 15, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	5/15/2024	5/15/2024 MTAC Meeting Agenda	051524M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	5/8/2024	MTAC Work Program as of 5/8/2024	051524M-02
3	Concept Plan	4/3/2024	Sherwood West Concept Plan	051524M-03
4	Proposal	4/3/2024	Sherwood West Urban Growth Boundary Expansion Proposal 2024	051524M-04
5	Attachment A	4/3/2024	Attachment A: Cover Letter	051524M-05
6	Attachment B	4/3/2024	Attachment B: Title 14 Findings	051524M-06
7	Attachment C	4/3/2024	Attachment C: Concept Plan	051524M-07
8	Attachment C1	4/3/2024	Attachment C1: Concept Plan Appendices	051524M-08
9	Attachment D	4/3/2024	Attachment D: City Council Resolutions	051524M-09
10	Attachment E	4/3/2024	Attachment E: IGA Agreements	051524M-10
11	Attachment F1	4/3/2024	Attachment F1: Service Provider Letters	051524M-11
12	Attachment F2	4/3/2024	Attachment F2: Employment and Housing Stakeholder Letters of Support	051524M-12
13	Attachment F3	4/3/2024	Attachment F3: Property Owner and Public Letters of Support	051524M-13
14	Attachment G	4/3/2024	Attachment G: Housing Needs Analysis Confirmation	051524M-14
15	Attachment H	4/3/2024	Attachment H: Map of Expansion Area	051524M-15
16	Presentation	5/15/2024	Sherwood West Concept Plan	051524M-16
17	Fact Sheet	N/A	WHAT IS THE Oregon Housing Needs Analysis (OHNA)?	051524M-17

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
18	Presentation	5/15/2024	OHNA: Metro Methodology and Initial Findings	051524M-18