A G E N D A

1. Visitors Comments (5 min)

✓ 2. Consideration of WCCC Minutes for June 9, 2014 Action (5 min)

✓ 3. Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) Options Discussion (30 min)
   
   Purpose: Review and discuss ACT options for the four county region.
   Provide input to ODOT Task Force members Commissioner Rogers and Mayor Doyle.
   
   Presenter: Chris Deffebach, Washington County

✓ 4. Greater Portland Export Initiative: Enhancing the Regional Cargo Market Presentation (30 min)
   
   Purpose: Review recommendations of the latest strategy under the Greater Portland Export Initiative identifying ways to increase the attractiveness of the Portland regional cargo market for international ocean and air carriers.
   
   Presenter: Scott Drumm, Research & Strategic Analysis Manager, Port of Portland

* 5. MPAC Agenda Information (5 min)
   
   Presenter: Mayor Peter Truax, City of Forest Grove

* 6. JPACT Agenda Information (5 min)
   
   Presenter: Mayor Denny Doyle, City of Beaverton

7. Other Business and Agency Updates Information (10 min)
   
   ● Transportation Development Tax Ordinance

✓ Material included in packet.

* Material will be distributed at the meeting.

^ Material available electronically and/or distributed in advance of the meeting.

Future WCCC Topics
Urban Growth Report
Housing Preference Survey Results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, September 8</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Meeting Room A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, October 6</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 10</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Meeting Room A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, December 8</td>
<td>Beaverton Library / Cathy Stanton Conference Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For agenda and schedule information, call Dyami Valentine at 503.846.3821
email: dyami_valentine@co.washington.or.us
WASHINGTON COUNTY COORDINATING COMMITTEE
POLICY GROUP SUMMARY
June 9, 2014

Voting Members:
Brian Biehl, Banks
Bill Middleton, Sherwood
Dennis Doyle, Beaverton
Gary Schirado, Durham
Jef Dalin, Cornelius
Jerry Willey, Hillsboro
John Cook, Tigard
Martha DeBry, North Plains
Lou Ogden, Tualatin
Peter Truax, Forest Grove
Roy Rogers, Washington County
Tim Knapp, Wilsonville

Non Voting Members
Kathryn Harrington, Metro

Attendees:
Andrew Singelakis, Washington County
Chris Deffebach, Washington County
Dyami Valentine, Washington County
Susan Aguilar, Washington County
Steve Kelley, Washington County
Steve Szegethy, Washington County
Mike Dahlstrom, Washington County
John Valley, Senator Merkley
Simina Mistreanu, The Oregonian
John Williams, Metro
Ted Reid, Metro
Julia Hajduk, Sherwood
John Leeper, Citizen
Mark Ottenad, Wilsonville
Todd Juhasz, Beaverton
Jenny Cadigan, Westside Transportation Alliance (WTA)

Chris Rall, Transportation for America (T4A)
Lisa Glancy, Port of Portland
Lisa Frank, BTA
Ben Bryant, City of Tualatin
Jeff Petrillo, Washington County
Rob Dixon, Hillsboro
Mary Manseau, Washington County Planning Commission
David Kim, ODOT
Don Odermott, Hillsboro
Anne Debbaut, Department of Land Conservation Development (DLCD)

Chairman Roy Rogers called the Washington County Coordinating Committee meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

Visitor Comments
None
**Consideration of Minutes**
Correction to the May 5, 2014 minutes on 1st page, under Attendees correcting first name Mac to Marc.

Chair Rogers moved to approve the minutes with correction and it was seconded.  
**Vote: Unanimous.**

**Urban Growth Report (UGR)**
Councilor Kathryn Harrington and Ted Reid from Metro gave a brief presentation on the UGR. Mr. Reid explained the UGR serves three primary purposes:

- Legal – assess whether the current urban growth boundary has enough room to accommodate future jobs and housing.
- Check-in – on how communities are developing and what are some of the opportunities and challenges faced.
- Technical basis to assist Metro in the growth management decision

Mr. Reid illustrated the relative accuracy of past regional forecasts; the region underestimated population and employment growth between 1985 and 2000 and over estimated growth between 2000 and 2010. The draft 2015-2035 forecasts is based on a range of population and employment growth rates: the mid-range for population results in a 25% increase and the mid-range for employment results in a 35% increase.

A draft of the UGR will be released in July. A copy of this draft will be introduced to the Metro Council work session on July 22 and then MPAC on July 23. In December 2014, Metro Council will decide whether to accept the growth report. The Counsel will make its growth management decision by the end of 2015.

**Transportation for America (T4A)**
Chris Rall of T4A gave a brief presentation about the organization. T4A is an alliance of elected, business and civic leaders from communities across the country, united to ensure that states and the federal government step-up to invest in smart locally-driven transportation solutions. Mr. Rall mentioned how T4A develops proposals based on five key fronts: Investment, local control, innovation, options and access to jobs. Membership benefits include: Timely insight to legislative issues (the T4A policy team focuses primarily on transportation issues), access to member-only resources which include discounts on events and consulting services, professional development and networking opportunities with business and civic leaders around the nation.

Washington County has partnered with Metro, City of Portland and Trivet to enroll for membership, utilizing the group rate option. Cities can access information through the county.

CITIES membership rates was suggested for a future agenda topic.

**Aloha-Reedville Study - canceled**
**MPAC Agenda**

Mayor Peter Truax reported the June 11, 2014 meeting topics will include:
- Extended Construction Excise Tax for Community Planning and Development Grant (Action)
- SW Corridor Steering Committee Recommendation to move forward into Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Action: Recommendation to Metro Council)
- Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project: Discuss findings and recommendations from Health Impact Assessment (Information/Discussion)

**June 25**
- Introduction to Metro Equity Strategy Program
- Active Transportation Plan (Action: Recommendation to Metro Council)
- 2014 Regional Transportation Plan Ordinance No. 14-1340 (Action: Recommendation to Metro Council)
- Referral of Metro Charter Language on Single Family Neighborhoods

**July 9**
- Tour of Forest Grove

**JPACT Agenda**

Mayor Dennis Doyle reported the June 12, 2014 meeting topics will include:
- SW Corridor Steering Committee Recommendation to move forward into Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Action: Recommendation to Metro Council)
- Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project: Discuss findings and recommendations from Health Impact Assessment (Information/Discussion)
- 2015 State Transportation Package JPACT Policy Development (Information)

**Other Business and Agency Updates**

Councilor Kathryn Harrington of Metro wanted to give thanks to everyone who participated at the May 20 Climate Smart Communities Summit. Summaries and recommendations were included in MPAC and JPACT meeting packets. Analysis will move forward this summer.

Mayor Dennis Doyle gave an update on the SW Corridor. At a June 9th meeting the Steering Committee decided to not enter into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) immediately and narrowed down the most complementary projects and improvements to improve accessibility. Further study is needed before the region commits additional funds for the DEIS.

Andrew Singelakis gave an update on the Washington County Transportation Study. The county received two proposals from two well qualified teams of consultants. Staff is reviewing the proposals and hope to have a consultant on-board by September. Mr. Singelakis acknowledged that members of the WCCC expressed an interest in serving in an advisory role including soliciting and/or nominating members to the Study’s advisory committee.

Mr. Singelakis also reported the Board of Commissioners had a public hearing on Vehicle Registration fee (VRF). There will be another public hearing with the Board of Commissioners on June 17th regarding whether to refer the VRF to the voters on the November ballot.
Chris Deffebach said the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) is scheduled to review and adopt the final Connect Oregon V project list. WCCC supported four different projects and the Tualatin River Greenway Trail Gap Project is the highest rank of the four projects supported. Following on that list is the Trimet Westside Bike and Ride Project. The Tigard Street Trail and the THPRD Water House Trail are further down the list.

David Kim of Oregon Department of Transportation gave a brief update regarding a memo from the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) that was included in the WCCC packet. Mr. Kim announced there will be a delay in the next State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) from 2017-2020 to 2018-2021 for a number of reasons. On the state level, there is a decline in revenue. Remaining state funds will be used for preservation and maintenance of the existing system. The commission will wait to see what happens at the federal level. If nothing happens, Oregon will lose $150 million and some projects may get delayed or postponed. The current STIP projects are moving forward, but could change if the federal government does not act in August for the Federal Highway Trust Fund.

Mr. Kim also shared there are two new commission members, Katherine Mater and Alonso Simpson. He also shared a map of ODOT Projects in Washington County for 2014-2018.

There was a discussion regarding possible cancellation of the July 7, 2014 WCCC meeting.

There being no other business, Chair Rogers adjourned meeting at 1:20 p.m.

Andrew Singelakis, Secretary
Washington County Coordinating Committee
PG 060914
Memorandum

Date: September 2, 2014

To: Washington County Coordinating Committee

From: Chris Deffebach, Policy Analyst

RE: Area Commission on Transportation Options

ODOT has convened a Task Force to recommend a structure for an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) for the Metro area counties plus Hood River. With the exception of Western Washington County, which is part of the NW ACT, these counties are the only ones in Oregon that do not have an ACT.

The Oregon Commission on Transportation established ACTs to improve communication and interaction between the OTC and local stakeholders who share a transportation-focused community of interest. The OTC has asked ACTs to provide recommendations on program funding allocations for the STIP, special funding opportunities and programs, coordinate with other organizations (e.g., MPOs, Community Solutions Teams) review modal plans among others.

The Technical Advisory Committee for the ODOT Task Force has identified ACT options, including either one ACT for the four county area or two ACTs, both with variations, as described below and illustrated in the attached chart. The ODOT ACT Task Force members have been asked to submit initial comments on the ACT options from colleagues. Commissioner Rogers and Mayor Doyle are Task Force members and are seeking input from the WCCC. This will be discussed at JPACT on September 11. The next ODOT Task Force meeting is on September 22, and they are scheduled to make a recommendation by December.

To recap, the options are:

- **Option 1A** – Establish a single ACT encompassing the full ODOT Region 1 territory. Two variations on this option are to include Hood River County in the Lower John Day ACT rather than the Region 1 ACT and include western Washington County in the Region 1 ACT rather than the Northwest ACT as currently configured.

- **Option 1B** – This is a variation on the single ACT approach but with the boundary extended to encompass the “commute-shed” around the Metro region. This would extend beyond the current boundary of ODOT Region 1 and include Woodburn, Newberg and Scappoose.
• Option 2A – This is a 2 ACT option that would establish an ACT around the geography of Metro and JPACT with a second ACT encompassing the balance of ODOT Region 1.

• Option 2B – This is a 2 ACT option that is organized around functional transportation issues rather than the ODOT Region 1 boundary. In addition to a Metro/JPACT ACT, there would be a second ACT organized around the Mt. Hood Loop (I-84, US 26, Hwy 35). The balance of the ODOT Region 1 geography would merge with the adjacent ACT based upon their common interest in transportation issues. This would entail merging southern Clackamas County with the Mid-Willamette Valley ACT and leaving western Washington County as part of the Northwest ACT.

• Status Quo – If the region fails to develop a recommendation on the formation of an ACT, ODOT has indicated they would continue to operate with an “ACT-like” structure and use the STIP Project Selection Committee in lieu of an ACT.

The following questions are intended to facilitate discussion:

1. **What are the benefits of a 1 ACT vs. 2 ACT approach for the County and its cities?**
   - Are there any benefits to engaging the transportation needs of Hood River County and rural Clackamas County in the 1 ACT option?
   - What would balanced urban and rural representation look like in the 1 ACT option?
   - Would the extra meetings for the ‘Super Act’ approach to making final project selection in the 2 ACT option effectively resolve project priorities among limited resources?
   - Would the 2 ACT structure seem duplicative of JPACT in the Metro area?

2. **How is rural Washington County best served?**
   - If 1 ACT included all of Washington County would rural Washington County remain in Region 2, and funding adjustments made?
   - How would Banks, North Plains and Gaston participate in the 1 ACT or 2 ACT Options?

3. **What formal or informal consultative role should the WCCC have in review of OTC policy and project priorities?**
   - Would the WCCC prefer to review and comment on major ACT agenda items, including modal plans, Connect Oregon, STIP projects?

**Cc: Andrew Singelakis, Director of Land Use & Transportation**

**Attachments: ACT Comparisons, Region 1 ACT Options, ODOT Region 1-ACT Models**
# ODOT Region 1 – ACT Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1A</th>
<th>OPTION 1B</th>
<th>OPTION 2A</th>
<th>OPTION 2B</th>
<th>ACT-like structures (Enhancement of current process)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geography</strong></td>
<td>All of ODOT Region 1</td>
<td>To capture commuting patterns, this “Commute Shed” ACT boundary would be expanded beyond ODOT Region 1 to include the next city in the commute-shed (i.e. Hood River and Hood River County; Sandy, Estacada, Molalla and the rest of rural Clackamas County; Woodburn; Newberg; Gaston, Banks and North Plains and the rest of rural Washington County; Scappoose) and would be transferred from their current ACT.</td>
<td>ACT 1: Metro/JPACT (including NW Multnomah County)</td>
<td>ODOT Region 1 STIP Project Selection Committee continues to operate for Enhancement project prioritization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Advantages</strong></td>
<td>A single ACT provides a single forum to set priorities. Dialogue between jurisdictions and stakeholders inside vs. outside Metro is facilitated. Provides for a unified voice for the entire Region to the OTC.</td>
<td>A single ACT provides a single forum to set priorities. A common understanding of the transportation needs within each neighboring city and along the route connecting to the Metro region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Builds greater understanding of various economic development issues, projects and needs of the different areas throughout Region 1</td>
<td>Would help facilitate the coordination of multi-modal urban transportation needs between Metro and neighboring communities. Dialogue between jurisdictions and stakeholders inside vs. outside Metro is facilitated. Provides for a unified voice for the entire Region to the OTC.</td>
<td>May avoid membership challenges associated with merging urban and rural areas within Region 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</td>
<td>Builds greater understanding of various economic development issues, projects and needs of the different areas throughout Region 1</td>
<td>Two committees may provide for more membership opportunities and allow for unique interests, such as the Forest Service and BLM, to participate in ACT.</td>
<td>Provides direct voice to Oregon Transportation Commission for each ACT on other issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Primary Disadvantages</strong></td>
<td>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</td>
<td>提供 for a unified voice for the entire Region to the OTC.</td>
<td>Ability to spend more time and focus on local needs. The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is possible that either the size of the ACT will be too large to effectively prioritize projects or too small to allow for extensive direct stakeholder representation. The region may be too complex for this model.</td>
<td>Would require a “Super ACT” prioritization process, or other undetermined means to unify recommendations to the OTC.</td>
<td>Would require a “Super ACT” prioritization process or other undetermined means to unify recommendations to the OTC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities outside the MPO, and in other ODOT Regions, may not see the value in this approach. In addition, the other affected ACTs might not agree to the required boundary adjustments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connects communities of interest by providing venues for:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides a single forum to set STIP priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- coordination of multi-modal urban transportation</td>
<td>Dialogue between jurisdictions and stakeholders inside vs. outside Metro could be facilitated if the membership is revised and the Committee takes on a broader role than STIP project prioritization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transportation needs around the Mt. Hood Loop by jurisdictions and stakeholders adjacent to the Loop.</td>
<td>Builds on, rather than duplicates, the County Coordinating Committee structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Coordination of transportation needs associated with routes to the Coast (US 26 and Hwy 8) with the other jurisdictions dealing with these routes.</td>
<td>Meets on an as-needed basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Coordination of transportation needs along the Hwy 211 and Hwy 213 corridors with other Mid-Willamette Valley jurisdictions dealing with these routes.</td>
<td>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The existing MPO function and responsibilities for JPACT would be unchanged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ODOT Region 1 – ACT Options

| Primary Disadvantages (continued) | If ACT membership is proportional to population the ACT will either be very large or leave rural areas feeling potentially under represented given that 89% of people in Region 1 live within the MPO boundary. Distance and capacity limitations may make it more difficult for some rural stakeholders to participate effectively. | If ACT membership is proportional to population the ACT will either be very large or leave rural areas feeling potentially under represented given that 89% of people in Region 1 live within the MPO boundary. Distance and capacity limitations may make it more difficult for some rural stakeholders to participate effectively. | Segregates the Region into areas unconnected by transportation challenges and opportunities rather than encouraging dialogue between urban and rural communities. For example, Banks would be in an ACT with Hood River rather than Hillsboro. 2 ACTs involve more meetings. Segregates the Region into communities of interest rather than encouraging dialogue between urban and rural communities. 2 ACTs involve more meetings. It is not certain that the existing Mid-Willamette Valley ACT is interested in adding new areas. |
| Membership | Jurisdictions and stakeholders throughout the 4-County area. Presumably, membership would include a strong overlap with JPACT. Each neighbor city should be represented and significant interests along the route connecting between neighbor cities and Metro. Presumably, membership would include a strong overlap with JPACT. | Each neighbor city should be represented and significant interests along the route connecting between neighbor cities and Metro. Presumably, membership would include a strong overlap with JPACT. | ACT 1: Metro area representation could start with JPACT or STIP Project Selection Committee members within the MPO. ACT 2: elected officials and stakeholders throughout ODOT Region 1 outside Metro |
| How is the STIP funding allocated? | A single 4-County priority list is established. | A single 4-County priority list is established. | Two separate priority lists would be reconciled by a meeting of representatives of the two ACTs together (as a Super-ACT). Western Washington County would participate in NWACT and Southern Clackamas County would be part of the Mid-Willamette ACT. Two separate priority lists would be reconciled by a meeting of representatives of the two ACTs together (as a Super-ACT). |
| Coordination and Communication | The County Coordinating Committees and JPACT would establish formal relationships with the ACT and would assume increased responsibilities for seeking consensus on their respective regional priorities for consideration by the ACT. Hood River County would establish a similar coordinating structure. Woodburn, Newberg and Scappoose would transfer to this “Commute-Shed” ACT and would need to establish coordination mechanisms with their current ACT. Western Washington county would be part of the new “Commute-Shed” ACT The County Coordinating Committees and JPACT would establish formal relationships with the ACT and would assume increased responsibilities for seeking consensus on their respective regional priorities for consideration by the ACT. Hood River County would establish a similar coordinating structure. | The relationship between the ACT and JPACT as the MPO would be formalized. The county Coordinating Committees would establish formal relationships with ACT 2 and would assume increased responsibilities for seeking consensus on their respective rural priorities for consideration by ACT 2. Hood River County would establish a similar coordinating structure. | The County Coordinating Committees and JPACT would establish formal relationships with the ACT and would assume increased responsibilities for seeking consensus on their respective regional priorities for consideration by the ACT. Hood River County would establish a similar coordinating structure. County Coordinating Committees and/or JPACT may request to have input on non-STIP items before the OTC. |
| Variations | Western Washington County could be in or out of ODOT Region 1 ACT Hood River County could align with the Lower John Day ACT Woodburn, Newberg and Scappoose could remain in their current ACT and a mechanism to coordinate with the Region 1 ACT would need to be established. | | Canby could be in the Metro Portland ACT rather than Mid-Willamette Valley ACT Western Washington County could be in or out of STIP Project Selection Committee |
Option 1A
ODOT Region 1 ACT
Variation 1: Add
Western Washington County
Option 2B

2 ACTs

“Communities of Interest”

ACT 1: JPACT/Metro area
ACT 2: Mt Hood Loop

Western Wash. Co. stays in NW ACT
Southern Clackamas Co. joins Mid-Willamette Valley ACT
Greater Portland Export Plan

Greater Portland has a global reputation when it comes to advanced urban planning, leading-edge sustainability, and a high quality of life for its citizens. However, its reputation as an economic leader is less recognized. In response, regional leaders are positioning Greater Portland to be a leader in the “next economy” through a strategic focus on target industry clusters, innovation, and international trade.

➤ Export Profile: Ninety percent of exports and export growth come from the top 10 exporting industries in the region including: manufacturing (computer and electronics, primary metals, machinery, and transportation), royalties, professional services, and travel and tourism. The computer and electronics products industry dominates local exports (57 percent of total volume; 63.3 percent of total growth). Top markets for exports from Greater Portland include countries in the Pacific Rim and Europe.

➤ State of Export Services: Greater Portland’s economy is rich with small and medium enterprises (SMEs) that have limited awareness of global opportunities or local export services and programs. Export services are considered good, but the system is fragmented, has gaps, and is reactive in nature. Export promotion is not fully integrated into the region’s target industry and business development efforts.

➤ Objectives and Strategies: The objectives of the export plan are to create and sustain regional jobs through export growth, promote a strong export culture, increase the number of firms exporting, and solidify Greater Portland’s position as a top 10 U.S. exporting metro. Four core strategies drive pursuit of these objectives:

1. Support and Leverage Primary Exporters in Computers and Electronics: Provide proactive economic development support to the computer and electronics industry, including an intense focus on growing the local supply chain (secondary exports) through strategic recruitment and existing business integration efforts.

2. Catalyze Under-Exporters in Manufacturing: Target a defined set of mid- to large-size high potential regional companies in the advanced manufacturing cluster with outreach and account management services: firm specific market analysis, targeted trade missions, and a peer-to-peer export mentoring program.

3. Build a Healthy Export Pipeline: Coordinate export services, fill service gaps, and improve market intelligence for new-to-export (NTE) and new-to-market (NTM) small- to mid-size firms (SMEs); includes the improvement of the region’s export culture through proactive marketing, developing an export web portal (“roadmap”), and establishing a regional export accelerator.

4. Branding and Marketing Portland’s Global Edge: ‘We Build Green Cities’: Package Greater Portland’s cluster strengths to support new market presence for the most innovative sectors. This begins with a clean tech initiative that offers regionally developed solutions to global challenges. Proactive marketing to sell Portland’s “Green City” story internationally around a set of industries, companies, and products with export potential and a travel and tourism component to attract international conventions, meetings, and tourists.
Export Plan Development
The development of Greater Portland’s export plan has been led by staff from the following regional coalition organizations:

Office of Portland Mayor Sam Adams (co-lead)
Portland Development Commission (co-lead)
Business Oregon
Columbia River Economic Development Council
Greater Portland, Inc.
Metro
Oregon Export Council
Port of Portland
Portland Business Alliance
Portland State University
Portland U.S. Export Assistance Center

In addition to the work of the strategy development team, Greater Portland sought significant input from a wide range of public sector organizations, higher education institutions, regional decision-makers, and private sector businesses through working sessions, one-on-one meetings, and presentations to regional boards and commissions.

For More Information
Noah Siegel
Director of International Affairs
Office of Portland Mayor Sam Adams
noah.siegel@portlandoregon.gov

About the Brookings-Rockefeller Project on State and Metropolitan Innovation
States and metropolitan areas will be the hubs of policy innovation in the United States and the places that lay the groundwork for the next economy. The Brookings-Rockefeller Project on State and Metropolitan Innovation will present fiscally responsible ideas state leaders can use to create an economy that is driven by exports, powered by low carbon, fueled by innovation, rich with opportunity and led by metropolitan areas.

Part of the Brookings-Rockefeller Project on State and Metropolitan Innovation, the Brookings Metropolitan Export Initiative (MEI) is a ground-up collaborative effort to help regional civic, business, and political leaders, with their states, create and implement customized Metropolitan Export Plans (MEPs), from which this summary export plan is drawn. These localized export plans will apply market intelligence to develop better targeted, integrated export-related services and strategies to help regions better connect their firms to global customers, as outlined by their individualized export goals.

About the Metropolitan Policy Program at the Brookings Institution
Created in 1996, the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program provides decision makers with cutting-edge research and policy ideas for improving the health and prosperity of cities and metropolitan areas including their component cities, suburbs, and rural areas. To learn more visit: www.brookings.edu/metro.

About The Rockefeller Foundation
The Rockefeller Foundation fosters innovative solutions to many of the world’s most pressing challenges, affirming its mission, since 1913, to “promote the well-being” of humanity. Today, the Foundation works to ensure that more people can tap into the benefits of globalization while strengthening resilience to its risks. For more information, please visit www.rockefellerfoundation.org.

Metropolitan Policy Program
at BROOKINGS
telephone 202.797.6139
fax 202.797.2965
web site www.brookings.edu/metro

BROOKINGS
THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION