



# Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, December 20, 2023 | 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  
Steve Koper  
Katherine Kelly  
Jamie Stasny  
Jessica Pelz  
Gary Albrecht  
Neelam Dorman  
Laura Kelly  
Gery Keck  
Cindy Detchon  
Tara O'Brien  
Bret Marchant  
Rachel Loftin  
Preston Korst  
Erik Cole  
Mike O'Brien

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County Community Member  
Multnomah County Community Member  
Washington County Community Member  
City of Portland  
Second Largest City in Clackamas County, Oregon City  
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin  
City of Vancouver  
Clackamas County  
Washington County  
Clark County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
North Clackamas School District  
TriMet  
Greater Portland, Inc.  
Community Partners for Affordable Housing  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Schnitzer Properties, Inc./ Revitalize Portland Coalition  
Green Infrastructure/Sustainability, Mayer/Reed, Inc.

## **Alternate Members Attending**

Kamran Mesbah  
Vee Paykar  
Faun Hosey  
Miranda Bateschell  
Erika Palmer  
Kevin Cook  
Theresa Cherniak  
Glen Bolen  
Kelly Reid  
Cassera Phipps  
Chris Faulkner  
Jeff Hampton  
Aaron Golub  
Jacqui Treiger  
Craig Sheahan

## **Affiliate**

Clackamas County Community Member  
Multnomah County Community Member  
Washington County Community Member  
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Wilsonville  
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Sherwood  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development  
Clean Water Services  
Clean Water Services  
Business Oregon  
Portland State University  
Oregon Environmental Council  
David Evans & Associates, Inc.

### **Guests Attending**

Adrienne DeDona  
Barbara Fryer  
Brian Hurley  
Bruce Coleman  
Dakota Meyer  
Eric Rutledge  
Kevin Young  
Kia Selley  
Marc Farrar  
Max Nonnamaker  
Nancy Chapin  
Rebecca Geisen  
Schuyler Warren  
Tracy Lunsford  
Valentina Peng

### **Affiliate**

JLA  
City of Cornelius  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Sherwood  
City of Troutdale  
City of Sherwood  
OR Dept. Land Conservation & Development  
North Clackamas Park & Recreation District  
Metropolitan Land Group, LLC  
Multnomah County Health Department  
TSG Services  
Regional Water Providers Consortium  
City of Tigard  
Parametrix  
JLA

### **Metro Staff Attending**

Cindy Pederson, Clint Chiavarini, Eliot Rose, Eryn Kehe, Glen Hamburg, Jake Lovell, Marie Miller, 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. Zoom logistics and meeting features were reviewed for online raised hands, renaming yourself, finding attendees and participants, and chat area for messaging and sharing links. An overview of the agenda was given.

### **Comments from the Chair and Committee Members**

- **Updates from committee members around the Region** – none given.
- **2024 MTAC meeting schedule and member poll on in-person meetings** (Chair Kehe) Poll questions were shared with members and alternate members on interest in meeting in-person with hybrid options, and frequency of meetings held in-person in 2024. Technical difficulties from the poll prevented final results, but information given at the meeting showed interest in meeting in-person with hybrid options on a quarterly basis. A survey will be given to members and alternate members to ask input on these questions. Results will be shared in January. A reminder was given on the MTAC 2024 meeting schedule included in the meeting packet.

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

### **Consideration of MTAC minutes November 15, 2023 meeting**

Chair Kehe asked for a vote to approve MTAC minutes from November 15, 2023 meeting.

**ACTION: Motion passed with no opposed, and 5 abstentions**

**EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant** (Eliot Rose, Metro/ Adrienne DeDona, JLA/ Tracy Lunsford, Parametrix) The presentation began with defining what the Climate Pollution Reduction Grants (CPRG) include. The CPRG grants are non-competitive, 4-year planning grants that fund states and

metropolitan areas (*The Portland-Vancouver metropolitan statistical area (MSA) includes Clackamas, Clark, Columbia, Multnomah, Skamania, Washington and Yamhill counties*) to create plans and identify strategies that:

- Significantly reduce greenhouse gases (GHGs) and offer other co-benefits
- Can be readily implemented by agency partners
- Are aligned with federal and state climate funding sources

The Climate Partners' Forum is a group of self-nominated technical staff from agencies across the MSA who help to steer the CPRG planning grant. These forum members review deliverables and provide feedback at key points, are typically lead climate staff in their organization, have expertise in different GHG emissions sectors and strategies (e.g., energy, buildings, transportation), and may join or leave the Forum at any time, and may invite other staff within their agency to participate.

Preliminary CAP round of planning (now-Mar '24) will focus on emissions and actions where public agencies are poised to achieve significant GHG reductions. Comprehensive CAP round of planning (Apr '24-Aug '25) will cover all relevant GHG emissions and actions. The second round of planning includes provided updates on GHG emissions and PCAP/CCAP implementation actions in the status report with other federal climate funds known later.

Highlighted were the CPRG implementation grants: the basics

- Total funding available: \$4.3b
- Individual grant amount: \$2m-500m
- Number of awards expected: 30-115
- EPA expects 50-70% of grants to be <\$10m
- Match required: none
- Grant period: 5 years
- Eligible applicants: states, municipalities, and tribes
- *Projects must be included in a PCAP to be eligible for CPRG implementation grants.*

The PCAP will be an action-driven plan that reviews potential projects and highlights those that best align with EPA's implementation funding criteria. It will focus on projects that are focused on reducing GHGs, can reduce GHG emissions within 5 years, are documented in existing plans, are detailed enough for us to understand potential GHG reductions, costs, and work plans, can be led by public agencies, and have a clear lead applicant with the capacity to develop an application.

Evaluation criteria EPA is looking for in the notice of funding opportunity (NOFO):

- Significantly reduce GHG emissions in a cost-effective manner (60 points)
- Have a clear, well-thought-out work plan (45)
- Have reasonable, well-documented budgets (45)
- Benefit people living in federally designated Low Income and Disadvantaged communities (35)
- Have a sound plan to track implementation and performance (30)
- Are led by agencies with a track record of successfully managing EPA grants (30)
- Provide quality jobs (5)

The PCAP 5-month timeline was presented. The importance of coordination was noted. In addition to the Portland-Vancouver region, Oregon, Washington, and the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, have received planning grants. Any projects identified in these PCAPs are also eligible for implementation grants. The initial screening criteria of projects was presented:

- Readiness: is information available?
- GHG reductions: likelihood of significant GHG reductions within 5 years
- Local agency authority: authority, resources and experience to lead implementation
- Scalability: can it benefit multiple agencies or communities within the MSA?
- Co-Benefits: especially with respect to equity

Priority action categories were described:

*Support EV transition through charging infrastructure*

*Make transit convenient, frequent, accessible and affordable*

*Make biking, walking and active transportation safe and convenient*

*Use technology to actively manage the transportation system*

*Improve building energy efficiency*

*And Other categories not related to transportation / land use*

Screening results for potential PCAP strategies was reviewed. Next steps with the program were described.

Comments from the committee:

Jamie Stasny noted one of the items that you said is rising to the top is implementation of congestion pricing in the region. I'm curious what that will look like and what you're imagining these grants could be used for in that vein of projects. Mr. Rose noted we're still figuring that out with a lot of details of implementation that continue to be worked out. With the stage we're at we are trying to screen out actions and identify the ones that do the most to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and are the most ready to go. We felt pricing belonged on the short list because it's a critical strategy to climate smart, which is our regional strategy for reducing transportation related GHG. It's such a big opportunity for the region to reduce GHG that we wanted to leave the door open to it.

Vee Paykar noted you mentioned that GHG was the highest scored criteria for the project, but there were others such as equity. How much of the criteria was the percentage of the score? Mr. Rose presented the slide in the presentation that detailed what EPA is looking for. There are 250 points total available. There are 60 points related to available for reducing GHG. The one related to work plan, budgets, performance and successful management of EPA grants are basically related to can the agency that's applying for this grant deliver on it. Do they have the plan and the experience to do that. Those four criteria collectively account for 150 points. And then there's 40 points related to equity and workforce development that provide quality jobs. But federal notices of funding are complicated and vague documents. For those interested in the details the implementation grant NOFO link was shared: <https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-09/CPRG%20General%20Competition%20NOFO.pdf>

Glen Bolen noted that re-looking at the scores, I'm thinking of transit access. We've done a lot of first last mile studies in this region. I know Washington County did a big one a few years ago. I could imagine, especially within where we have equity focus areas that good quality access to transit stops would be very successful in high scoring. I think it's pretty implementable and gets to the human health and safety goals in our local plans and the RTP.

Tara O'Brien agreed with Mr. Bolen's comments. The EPA is very interested in the very quantifiable GHG emission reduction in terms of the implementation grants. So what Metro has been leading now is looking at the strategies that we can point to some data through Climate Smart and other work we've done in the region to quantify those. As we are trying to hone in on what the most successful

implementation grants could be, we're looking closely at those criteria that you just brought up and what can we quantify GHS emission reduction from. I think access to transit could be apart of that, but we have been trying to look at what types of projects would be most successful. Looking at some of the analysis we've done through Climate Smart, what can we point to the emissions reduction the most either through fleet transition or known mode shift, and trying to connect those things which serves the areas that EPA cares most about. I think there are a lot of pieces that could come into play in implementation grants that we're talking with partners about and how to possibly combine some of those into the most successful application.

Joseph Edge agreed with the pedestrian access to transit plan for use with new funds. Getting sidewalks built, particularly in unincorporated Clackamas County is nearly impossible. This could be true in other areas of the region as well, and hopefully score high with the criteria. It was noted that building rails to everywhere is just really expensive. One idea mentioned was kind of a full build out of the FX bus network to where we have frequent express routes that aren't necessarily just an upgrade of the bus route that it's replacing, but maybe are thinking about providing connections between all of the regional centers on the region 2040 plan. In this manner we would have a high quality capacity transit by definition. Again, build out that FX network to help serve policy goals as opposed to just replace bus line that has really good ridership which obviously is a criteria that we shouldn't ignore. But maybe a more ambitious plan that isn't purely focused on the highest ridership lines, but it also focuses on connecting key destinations where maybe easy transit trips don't already exist and maybe one day transition to rail on the plan.

Vee Paykar noted it was really important that we think about the other modes that reduce GHG emissions, not simply change our entire fleet to electric. When you build out complete streets you are reducing GHG emissions. It's just harder to quantify. It is something you like to see in the long term with the change of pedestrians reduction in traffic violence and all these other things that allow for people to want to be able to take other modes safely. How do we not lose these opportunities in the grants and how can we demonstrate this.

Gary Albrecht noted appreciation of including Clark County part of these discussions and will continue to collaborate on these efforts as much as possible.

**Draft Sherwood West Concept Plan** (Erika Palmer & Eric Rutledge, City of Sherwood) The Sherwood West Concept Plan was described as large Urban Reserve area located just to the west of Sherwood city limits, which the City of Sherwood has identified as an area for future growth. Future development in Sherwood West will require expansion of the Metro urban growth boundary (UGB). Since 2016, the city and surrounding areas have seen significant changes including:

- Shifting of City Council priorities focusing on employment and job growth to diversify the city's tax base,
- Construction of a new high school within the Sherwood West study area,
- Adoption of the Sherwood 2040 Comprehensive Plan, and
- Recent changes to statewide and local housing regulations to plan for "missing middle housing" in residential areas.

Information on the plan provided a general framework for locating various land uses, transportation networks, open spaces, and public services. Once the area is brought into the UGB, the City will conduct additional analysis and undertake a comprehensive planning effort to refine the general concepts that are laid out in the Concept Plan – a necessary next step prior to land being eligible for

future annexation and development. The planning and engagement process was described. Information on the plan included land use, transportation, and green space.

The City of Sherwood will have the ability to request expansion of the UGB to include Sherwood West in 2024. There is more work to be done to prepare Sherwood West for future growth and development. The comprehensive planning and zoning process offers an opportunity for the City to reach out to affected property owners and the larger community to refine higher-level concepts. Robust community engagement, in addition to further evaluation of the topics addressed in this plan, will be an essential component of the City's next steps in developing refined plans and future regulations for Sherwood West.

Comments from the committee:

Joseph Edge noted particular interest in the concept of the middle housing zones in order to try and make sure that we're actually seeing some productivity there. You mentioned on your upcoming steps where this is found. Can you provide any kind of enlightenment on how you've done this before or how it might change in terms of guaranteeing that kind of orderly annexation, and to make sure that the properties are actually being brought into the city. In particular, I'm thinking about the larger parcel, employment and industrial land. How do we make sure that we're actually getting those within city limits?

Eric Rutledge noted that all of us as practitioners and planning, engineering and development planners want orderly growth and our city council does as well. We think we can accomplish the orderly growth mainly through annexation policy. Right now our annexation policy is relatively minimal. So we likely, as part of the next phase, will update our annexation policy and likely require an annexation agreement with a property owner or developer before they come into the city.

Infrastructure is one of the biggest challenges with development. By the time you get through annexation and you get into a land use phase it's not too late. You can address things at that point but you have less opportunity to address shared interests and infrastructure with a developer or property owner. The annexation agreement allows us to get in front of that, get partnerships with them and make sure we get the transportation, street improvements, storm water management and all that goes with urbanization. At the same time we don't want to discourage development but what we definitely don't want is disorderly development and issue with traffic, storm water and other factors.

Carol Chesarek asked, with the middle housing and the cottage cluster housing, what has been done in the code to ensure how the desired housing types will actually be built at the price points you are looking for? Mr. Rutledge noted the reason we want middle housing and cottage cluster is because by their nature they'll be smaller and more affordable. So we have some of that built in already. At the last WA Co. TAC meeting discussion was held on a reduced or lower TDT (transportation development tax) for middle housing right now. If they built that today based on that reduced TDT we really haven't gotten into any type of agreements with developers to deliver at a certain price point, deeded restrictions and things like that. I think the approach to start would be to see if we can get that housing at the price points based on a market approach. If we feel we can't do that I think we would consider other options as well. Our first approach will be through sort of basic incentives, reduced SDC for this type of housing, maybe more density. It was noted much of this work is yet to come if this area comes into the growth boundary.

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich noted the hospitality zone and wondered if there's a model that you used and how you are thinking about incentivizing that development space. Mr. Rutledge noted we have started to engage lightly and informally with stakeholders who might have interest in being involved (developers, winemakers, master planner). It's something we need to do a lot more work on. Examples of winery tasting rooms and associated development was shared.

Chair Kehe added a little more context around this in terms of the urban growth boundary decision. I'm sure you all remember we've talked a lot about the production of the Urban Growth Report, which is a report that will present all of the data and information that you've begun to learn about how we're collecting. It includes those 3 parts of looking at capacity inside the growth boundary to accommodate needed growth in the future as well as demand and growth looking out 20 years for the region. This is the math problem between what our projected need is and what our supply is inside the growth boundary, and what needed land we have for the future. This comes together with readiness. All of that comes together in the Urban Growth Report which the committee will be along for the ride as each piece comes together.

**Urban Growth Boundary discussion topic: Town and regional centers and CFEC (Update to Title 6)**

(Glen Hamburg, Metro) Background and an overview of a state requirement to amend Title 6, *Centers, Corridors, Station Communities, and Main Streets*, of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan in order to require local adoption of boundaries for regional and town centers was provided. The Growth Concept foresees numerous walkable, higher-density, mixed-use centers of employment, housing, cultural and recreational activities, and transit service across the region, with those centers helping to grow the economy, provide affordable housing, and promote vibrant and distinctive communities that reduce the need for sprawl and minimize transportation costs and contributions to climate change.

There are three types of 'centers' envisaged in the 2040 Growth Concept:

1. The **Central City**, which includes areas such as Downtown Portland, Old Town/Chinatown, the Pearl, Goose Hollow, South Waterfront, the Lloyd District, Lower Albina, and the Central Eastside, is the region's business and cultural hub, indeed the primary center for finance, commerce, government, retail, tourism, arts, and entertainment with the most intensive development of housing and employment.
2. **Regional centers**, serving hundreds of thousands of people in major urban areas outside the Central City and surround high-quality transit service, multi-modal street networks, and nodes of regional through-routes. Regional centers are typically characterized by two- to four-story employment and housing development, larger commercial uses, healthcare facilities, and local government services.
3. **Town centers**, which are smaller than regional centers and serve populations of tens of thousands of people. They offer more locally focused retail uses, like restaurants, cafes, brewpubs, childcare facilities, cinemas, and dry cleaners and public amenities like libraries and community halls. Town centers are typified by one- to three-story buildings for employment and housing, as well as a strong sense of community identity.

Over the last couple years, Oregon's Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) has updated certain Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) as part of the state's Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) program. CFEC aims to reduce greenhouse gas pollution and improve social equity in transportation services and community health, safety, and livability. To those ends, CFEC includes measures intended to accelerate the development and transformation of Metro's centers in ways that are consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept and RFP policies.

Implementing CFEC measures for centers necessitates defining a geographic area where those measures apply. OAR 660-012-0012(4)(d) therefore requires Metro to amend UGMFP Title 6 by the end of 2024 to include a mandate that cities and counties adopt boundaries of the regional and town centers for which they have land use planning authority and for which they have adopted urban land use designations. Cities and counties in the region then have until the end of 2025 to adopt those center boundaries. The locally adopted boundaries must be in the general location of the center as depicted on the 2040 Growth Concept Map.

Over the next year, Metro staff will continue to have dialogue with staff of cities and counties, DLCD, and other stakeholders to refine the amendments to UGMFP Title 6 intended to comply with CFEC requirements before submitting a formal proposal of amendments for review by MTAC, MPAC, and ultimately the Metro Council to be considered for adoption by the Metro Council with the 2024 Urban Growth Report. Details on the amendment requirements were reviewed in the presentation.

Comments from the committee:

Joseph Edge asked if the intent from CFEC that the adopted boundaries of the region 2040 centers will need to be treated and regulated as the climate friendly areas that are required of non-Metro jurisdictions in the state. Mr. Hamburg agreed, that's the kind of idea that outside of Metro there are these climate friendly areas. Inside of Metro we already have these 2040 centers that sort of look and act like what these climate friendly areas are. So in the Metro region the climate friendly areas will be these regional and town centers.

Kevin Young added the requirements that are established for climate friendly areas in downtown NPO's will not be applied to town and regional and central city centers in the Metro region. Essentially, it's continuing to implement the Climate Smart Communities program and the program that's already ongoing in the Metro region. There are some associated requirements. One of the things that happens with the designation, with the adoption of the centers, is a permutation in terms of transportation impact review. Zone changes in those areas would not go through the old significant effect test process. There's a new process that is significantly onerous and more streamlined and more focused on promoting transportation options in town and regional centers. That will also be in effect within the Metro region, but the zoning minimum densities allowed, building heights, all of that stuff is not a component within the Metro region. The 30% requirement for housing does not apply for housing so that calculation is necessary.

Mr. Edge noted, then in the spirit of CFEC, even if the state isn't requiring it, we might want to consider that jurisdictions target 30% of their housing in their designated centers. There's a proposal underway to require Metro counties, urban counties to plan for housing needs analyses for their unincorporated areas that are not intended to be brought into cities. I would encourage us to want to see the new housing be targeted for centers in the unincorporated parts of counties that are under that county planning authority. To that end I'd like you to describe the role of station communities and how they relate to centers and why they're not included in this proposal.

Mr. Hamburg noted the quick answer is they're not included in this proposal because CFEC is not requiring Metro to do that. We once had a requirement for the adoption of center boundaries and then those requirements were removed, and now we're at this incentive approach. We are back to the idea that in order to focus certain regulatory provisions we need to define what that geography is, meaning that we need to adopt boundaries. CFEC didn't require all jurisdictions to have boundaries for station



communities being specifically focused around light rail. And not all centers are focused around a light rail transit stop.

Mr. Edge noted we don't have the high capacity transit element present in all our centers. With that in mind, station communities provide that benefit of having existing high capacity transit access for that surrounding area. I would encourage us to figure out a way that we can guarantee, through defining boundaries, requiring boundaries and zoning designations adopted around station communities. Particularly the ones that already exist that haven't seen such designation changes. I think that's an important thing moving forward to consider the role of station communities and how they compliment what we're trying to do with CFEC. And not to look at it as what the minimum compliance is required by the state, but what we are trying to do for the 2040 concept.

Mr. Hamburg noted in some cases some station communities overlap with a 2040 center. So there will be some cases where the boundaries get adopted for a center and end up having some benefits for the station community that's in there. Chair Kehe added there has been discussion on the need to update the 2040 vision. This kind of bigger policy question is one of those that is something that we should reflect on in thinking about a 2040 update.

Glen Bolen noted a recent presentation from the City of Portland on the Multnomah Montgomery Park redevelopment plan with the Streetcar elements among them. The planning described with urban transportation in this central city area could be related to town or regional center level of intensity development. Is this playing into the 30% or more of populations in these centers? Are there thoughts on this or a path planned? Would Portland be expanding sort of the city in this method? Would they be creating a new semi-regional center or town center? If you look at Portland's comprehensive plan I see places like 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue for example that have center like characteristics to their plans, too.

Tom Armstrong noted when the City of Portland updated their comprehensive plan in 2016 we designated a number of local town centers that aren't on the 2040 map that Mr. Hamburg mentions, to reach sort of town center level of activities and we would be interested in either as part of this process, or some upcoming process, to be able to recognize those town centers in the regional context. Mr. Bolen added when we look at context mapping for use of the urban design blueprint, that's one of the things that we look at. I noticed Portland had made these town center like designations along roads like 82<sup>nd</sup> that reflect how we do our assessments.

Michael O'Brien thanked Mr. Edge for bringing up the station communities and centers discussion. It's interest looking at the map the stated communities are shown on the Metro map. I think it's important that we start to look at these as a way to build ourselves out of the housing crisis in one sense, but also in terms of climate resiliency. These areas, as they were designed and sold to the public with the light rail, was that we are going to build up communities at the light rail stops. That has not happened in my view to the extent or even close to the extent that they need to for making an impact on this. I think if we can incentivize and place stricter restrictions on what happens in these areas and provide some benefit or monetary benefit to developers to increase and expand on these areas, I think we are doing ourselves a great favor on a number of different fronts. I would wholeheartedly say let's be thinking of those a little more closely as we talk about 2040.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:21 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting December 20, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	12/20/2023	12/20/2023 MTAC Meeting Agenda	122023M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	12/8/2023	MTAC Work Program as of 12/8/2023	122023M-02
3	Memo	11/16/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Marie Miller, Metro RE: 2024 Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) Meeting Schedule	122023M-03
4	Minutes	11/15/2023	Draft minutes from MTAC 11/15/2023 meeting	122023M-04
5	Draft Resolution from City of Sherwood	July 18, 2023	RESOLUTION 2023-060 ACCEPTING THE SHERWOOD WEST CONCEPT PLAN	122023M-05
6	Report	July 18, 2023	Sherwood West Concept Plan	122023M-06
7	Appendix A	July 18, 2023	APPENDIX A Future Development Timeline	122023M-07
8	Appendix B	July 18, 2023	APPENDIX B Housing Policy Implications Memo	122023M-08
9	Appendix C	July 18, 2023	Appendix C Public Engagement Plan	122023M-09
10	Appendix D	July 18, 2023	Appendix D Open House #1 (Online) Summary	122023M-10
11	Appendix E	July 18, 2023	Appendix E Open House #2 and Survey Summary	122023M-11
12	Appendix F	July 18, 2023	Appendix F Development Trends and Implications Memo	122023M-12
13	Appendix G	July 18, 2023	Appendix G Economic Opportunities Memo	122023M-13
14	Appendix H	July 18, 2023	Appendix H Transportation Issues Memo	122023M-14
15	Appendix I	July 18, 2023	Appendix I Plan Concepts	122023M-15
16	Appendix J	July 18, 2023	Appendix J Alternatives Evaluation Memo	122023M-16
17	Appendix K	July 18, 2023	Appendix K Developer Tour Summary	122023M-17

<b>Item</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
18	Appendix L	July 18, 2023	Appendix L Transportation Impact Analysis	122023M-18
19	Appendix M	July 18, 2023	Appendix M Housing Memo	122023M-19
20	Appendix N	July 18, 2023	Appendix N Infrastructure and Phasing Analysis	122023M-20
21	Appendix O	July 18, 2023	Appendix O Preliminary Infrastructure Funding Strategy	122023M-21
22	Presentation	12/20/2023	Sherwood West Concept Plan	122023M-22
23	Memo	12/13/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Glen Hamburg, Associate Regional Planner RE: CFEC-Required Amendments to UGMFP Title 6 for Regional and Town Centers	122023M-23
24	Presentation	12/20/2023	CFEC and 2040 Centers	122023M-24
25	Presentation	12/20/2023	EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (CPRG)	122023M-25
26	Handout	12/20/2023	Technical Memorandum – Draft Screening Results for PCAP Strategies	122023M-26