



Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) workshop meeting**

Date/time: Wednesday, April 20, 2022 | 9:30 a.m. to noon

Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

Members, Alternates Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Jamie Stasny
Steve Williams
Allison Boyd
Erin Wardell
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Peter Hurley
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Don Odermott
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Glen Bolen
Laurie Lebowsky
Tom Bouillion
Katherine Kelly
Tom Armstrong
Colin Cooper
Jean Senechal Biggs
Chris Damgen
Erika Palmer
Adam Barber
Kevin Cook
Gary Albrecht
Laura Kelly
Shelly Parini
Aisha Panas
Cindy Detchon
Darci Rudzinski
Brett Morgan
Ramsay Weit
Dr. Gerard Mildner

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Clackamas County
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
Southwest Washington Reg. Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
City of Vancouver
City of Portland
City of Hillsboro
City of Beaverton
City of Troutdale
City of Sherwood
Multnomah County
Multnomah County
Clark County
Department of Land & Conservation Development
Clackamas County Water Environmental Services
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
North Clackamas School District
Private Economic Development Organizations
1000 Friends of Oregon
Housing Affordability Organization Representative
Portland State University

Guests Attending

Warren Schuyler
Cody Field
Steve Koper
Susie Wright
Molly McCormick

Affiliate

City of Tigard
City of Tualatin
City of Tualatin
Kittelson & Associates
Kittelson & Associates

Garet Prior
Vanessa Vissar
Lidwien Rahman
Lucia Ramirez
Matt Berkow
Joseph Auth
Steve Kelley
Clay Veka
Dave Roth
Manuel Contreas
Will Farley
Mike Foley

Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Portland
City of Hillsboro
Washington County
Portland Bureau of Transportation
City of Tigard
WES
City of Lake Oswego

Metro Staff Attending

Ted Leybold, Planning Resource Manager
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Tech Strategist & Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Molly Cooney-Mesker, Communications
Alex Oreschak, Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, TPAC & MTAC Recorder

Kim Ellis, Senior Transportation Planner
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Principal Transportation Planner
Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner
Thaya Patton, Senior Researcher & Modeler
Grace Stainback, Associate Transportation Planner
Marne Duke, Senior Transportation Planner

Call meeting to order, introductions and committee updates (Chair Kloster)

Chair Tom Kloster called the workshop meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made. The meeting format held in Zoom with chat area for shared links and comments, screen name editing, mute/unmute, and hands raised for being called on for questions/comments were among the logistics reviewed. Workshops will be held openly for all onscreen for full participation.

Public /Committee Communications on Agenda Items – none provided

Consideration of MTAC/TPAC workshop summary of February 16, 2022 – no edits or corrections

Regional Mobility Policy Update: Shaping the Recommended Policy and Action Plan (Kim Ellis, Metro/ Glen Bolen, ODOT/ Susan Wright, Kittelson & Associates) Ms. Ellis began with the planned presentation that would cover updates from past meetings and what has been heard, discussion of draft application measures and discussion of questions the project team is working through. Per the timeline, currently the project is reporting findings, developing the Mobility Policy and Action Plan, with public review and interim action leading to implementation this fall. The link to the project webpage was shared: oregonmetro.gov/mobility. It was noted there is a 2-minute video on the webpage that explains what the regional mobility policy is and why it's important.

Ms. Wright reminded the committees on draft mobility policies for the Portland region

1. Ensure that the public's investment in the transportation system enhances efficiency in how people and goods travel to where they need to go.
2. Provide people and businesses a variety of seamless and well-connected travel modes and services that increase connectivity, increase choices and access to low carbon transportation options so that

people and businesses can conveniently and affordably reach the goods, services, places and opportunities they need to thrive.

3. Create a reliable transportation system, one that people and businesses can count on to reach destinations in a predictable and reasonable amount of time.

4. Prioritize the safety and comfort of travelers in all modes when planning and implementing mobility solutions.

5. Prioritize investments that ensure that Black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC) community members and people with low incomes, youth, older adults, people living with disabilities and other historically marginalized and underserved communities experience equitable mobility.

The March 2022 TPAC survey and April 2022 Practitioners Forum provided input that was shared with the committee. These were shown in the presentation, and included:

- Draft mobility policies
- Draft Recommended Measures:
 - Multi-modal Measure – System completeness (all modes)
 - • Supports equity, safety, expanded travel options
 - Congestion Measure – Travel speed (with queuing and hours of congestion)
 - • Supports reliability, access by vehicle and for longer distance trips
 - Efficiency Measure – VMT per capita (home-based trips)
 - • Supports climate goals, efficient land use patterns, reduced vehicle travel, expanded travel options

Potential applications of measures in the updated mobility policy

System Completeness Measure

Travel Speed Measure

VMT/Capita Measure

The comparison between current and potential approach in determining significant impact with the plan amendment was presented. The Potential System Planning Integration and Potential Plan Amendment Assessment Process was outlined. Questions the project team are still working through:

- Should we have a congestion measure for arterials outside 2040 Centers?
- Should we re-consider travel time instead of travel speed?
- What constitutes a significant impact on non-auto modes?
- How can the policy integrate with development review standards in the near-term and long-term?

Meeting dates with committees and Metro Council in the next 3 months were outlined. Summer of 2022 it is expected to develop recommended policy and action plan for public review and consideration by regional policymakers and OTC to apply in 2023 RTP update.

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse noted the recognition of the proposed policies with clarity on rules for RTP and other regional planning efforts. The VMT language is now written more broadly and appreciates the interaction with system planning, as noted in the presentation: RTP establishes regional and subarea(?) baseline household VMT/capita needed to meet Division 44 (GHG Reduction Rule), can be used to understand jurisdictional/subarea 2045 household, VMT/Capita. Use to assess

if a plan amendment will reduce region or area's VMT/capita or VMT/employee. Target – Apply/Not apply as a standard/target for local TSPs?

It was noted the travel speed/travel time input in the presentation were part of the regional growth concepts discussion, and how we relate these tools tied to safety and reliability issues. It was appreciated for the proposed workflow process approaches. Encouragement was given to use the expert panel to hear from those working on this issue, learning what tools we can develop with a travel demand model that is consistent with data. Regarding the system completeness, how we have access to travel should be included, as well as who and how may are using certain facilities.

Ms. Ellis agreed that comments on the rules are helping us get better understanding of how or if they will apply to local TSPs. Ms. Wright added that many elements will challenge us to prioritize in the system. Discussions and questions raised in the survey and forum will help us develop policies from the proposed approaches.

- Erin Wardell noted the many years taken with system development and assessment review with Washington County, and appreciated the efforts regionally. It was noted congestion took place not in just centers but in-between places and should be included as part of this approach and as important to have a measure for this.

Regarding travel time/travel speed, it was noted the Practitioners Forum raised concern on travel speed, which can be problematic. It should relate measures to outcomes. Technical tools to do these measurements with speed of any measurable length is not helpful.

Regarding the impact on non-motor modes, we need to look at the development of thresholds of trip generation. This can be more difficult when looking at smaller scale of development. Best practices exist for that thresholds to use and worth looking into more. There are challenges with non-auto modes getting from point A to point B which could be simply filling in the sidewalk, where congestion won't be measured or need to adjustments in measurements for pedestrians. The focus should be to build the system completeness.

It was noted a lot more thinking needs to be done before bringing down to development review level. Tools need to actually measure our system. The reasons we use the 4-step TDM is useful for what it is, but we need to understand the limitations and find what other tools are available. Ms. Wardell offered to discuss more comments with the project team.

- Steve Williams appreciated the amount of work that went into a challenging and complex project. Regarding the VMT per capita measure, it was asked was the intent a single VMT per capita measure in the jurisdiction, or different VMT measures based on locations of land context over the region. Ms. Wright noted that setting targets is challenging that result in getting to VMT reductions and still being discussed. Ms. Ellis added further work with the modeling team to find VMT group patterns that are time sensitive rather than jurisdictional may help, with past case studies adding further insight.

- Don Odermott appreciated the efforts from the team on this project. It was noted the challenge of spatially relevancy for impact areas regarding system completeness, especially in terms of evaluating the areas. These need to be better defined. In regards to mobility on the arterials it was encouraged to look at the entire system, recognizing some areas of congestion with other areas less impacted. Performance standards operationally just won't occur. Another concern is travel corridors and how long this is measured for speed. Again, better definitions are needed.

It was noted VMTs in zones differ between small cities and larger areas with blended land uses. The model may not reflect this data. It was suggested to look at VMT and land supply with regional significant industrial areas, between different service sectors. The VMT measures between city and regional levels need to be defined with possible consequences. System completeness should not ignore the success with private development when this occurs. It was suggested we need to be smart with how we partner and leverage funds. And when thinking of large planned amendments land may lay next to or between developments currently in stages.

Ms. Ellis noted the definition of arterials is included in the RTP and none are identified as collector streets. These are map specific in the RTP. The measures being discussed are looking to be multi-modal with data in the models needing updates since pre-COVID. It was noted of the system gap with service in north/south bus service in Hillsboro. Ms. Ellis noted the RTP defines future transit service planned in these areas and are driving to meet these goals. Glen Bolen noted TriMet holding service area planning workshops currently including ridership coverage and equity scenarios. Ms. Wright added they are working toward policy development review including transit development plans.

- Colin Cooper noted the relationship between VMTs, TDMs, and the Urban Growth Boundary, and if nearby satellite cities within the UGB are growing and residents are leaving their quickly growing communities that are now using state facilities as destinations, how does this work in regard to the Mobility Policy when it comes to future planned amendments. These issues will be raised in different forums as we start to grow and have communities impacted inside the Urban Growth Boundary.

Ms. Ellis noted future evaluations can show us how the system is working and whether mitigations are needed or how the system is being managed. Burden on local jurisdictions are not intended for mobility issues per travel demand changes, and more study on this issue is needed. Ms. Wright added that with the VMT per capita per home based trips these look at certain cities in the region, but could continue to be evaluated for changes with growth. It was noted they could look at VMT per capita household in regards to home/employment trips.

Mr. Cooper presented a scenario where employment land was being depleted in one city, and nearby satellite community outside the UGB now has employment land added or have increased their availability. The household may take state facilities across the region elsewhere which places demand to increase the UGB.

- Ms. Wardell noted calculating the household VMT may appear a bit misleading on how it's being discussed. It was noted you are looking at the length of traveled miles within the city. Further description was provided; when you do the 4-steps of the travel demand model you start out with trip generation for all the households in the TDM, but you could pull out the households in one city. The model does trip distribution for origin/stops/destination to show how far people are traveling. The model then assigns these to modes. Then we know how many of these trips are traveled by vehicle.

Once it moves into mode, the model does assignments and places them on the model network links. Multiply that number of vehicles by the link. When you add up all the vehicles of miles traveled you can then do the per capita calculation based on the VMT. What is important to remember is that vehicles assigned on the link are not necessarily assigned to the certain city household. Other cities have been distributed throughout the city from other sections of the region.

Thaya Patton and Erin Wardell added further comments on the challenges with measuring VMT per capita, including household locations, jurisdictional zones, employment destinations, densities, and transit service available. Ms. Wright added that there's lots of assumptions the model is making at each of the 4-step modeling steps and currently we use those to generate v/c ratios that help us make land use and transportation decisions. Looking at changes in VMT/capita associated with land use and transportation plan amendments can give us more nuanced information about the impact of the changes at achieving a range of goals even if neither forecast v/c nor forecast VMT/capita is accurate or precise when looking 20 years out. Ms. Wardell agreed that our current measures are problematic for their own reasons. It's important to think of these as comparative measures and accept that they aren't going to be accurate.

- Shelly Parini noted in regard to system completeness around transit service an important component of consideration. With not only the pre-conceived and level of service, in the past 2 decades older/aging residents in Metro's east regional district communities still lack sidewalk connectivity to bus stops. People who live within these rapidly growing high-density areas among older neighborhoods and communities are standing out in the rain, in the street, without sidewalks or shelter. It was encouraged to take this into consideration when adopting these policies for system completeness and equity.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy brief – Congestion Pricing Policy Development (Alex Oreschak, Metro) The presentation provided information on planning and project context, summary of RCPS work to date, schedule for the RTP Update, 2018 RTP and RCPS findings and recommendations, and next steps. Background on the Regional Congestion Pricing Study (RCPS) included the study process and key findings.

- All four pricing types addressed climate and congestion priorities.
- All eight scenarios reduced the drive alone rate, vehicle miles traveled, and emissions, while increasing daily transit trips.
- Geographic distributions of benefits and costs varied by scenario.
- Some scenarios identified higher impacts than others.

The committees were reminded that in September 2021, Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 21-5179 to accept the findings and recommendations in the final report. Resolution No. 21-5179 additionally directed staff to incorporate the findings and recommendations from the study in the 2023 RTP update and use them to inform the 2023 RTP update. In order to identify the congestion pricing policy gap analysis, the project team will work with TPAC and MTAC to review existing congestion pricing policy language in the 2018 RTP and identify policy gaps to be addressed in the 2023 RTP update, develop and refine draft congestion pricing policy language options, and incorporate congestion pricing policy language options into the 2023 RTP update.

2018 RTP policies reviewed were noted for the following chapters, including RCPS objectives and strategies for each:

- RTP Goals and Objectives (Ch. 2)
- Transportation Equity (Ch. 3)
- Climate Leadership (Ch. 3)
- Transportation Safety (Ch. 3)
- Travel Demand Management (Ch. 3)
- Regional Motor Vehicle Network (Ch. 3)
- Emerging Technology (Ch. 3)
- Mobility Corridors Refinement Plans (Ch. 8)

Next steps in the project were shared. The committees are asked to provide written feedback by Wednesday, May 4. At the June 3 TPAC meeting, discussion on the draft policy language options will be presented. This summer there is a joint Metro Council/JPACT workshop planned. The project team will return to TPAC this fall to review draft RTP policy language and guidance. Later this fall related work on the RTP financially constrained revenue forecast and RTP finance chapter, including congestion pricing assumptions and equitable financing background research will be presented.

Comments from the committee:

- Cindy Detchon asked why equity would be different embedded in any of the priorities. Ms. Oreschak noted this is part of the policy development, and important to address equity in all stages of development.
- Peter Hurley noted it would be important to call out regional pricing policy to reduce VMT consistent with regional and state targets.
- Eric Hesse noted more written comments will be sent from the City of Portland. Notes from this presentation included the crosswalk of findings from the study helps us see how scattered the elements are with need to consolidate and be more consistent for better development of policies. The language may need revisiting for better understanding between managing congestion/ managing demand. It was agreed the tools of the developed policy works differently in scenarios and have tradeoffs, which need to be designed to optimize them.

The RCP is helpful and grounding, but we each test independent strategies. So far they have not been aligned to identify and help mitigate conflicting issues such as diversion, system planning and safety. As we look to advance our goals from these tools in the RTP, the language in the policy development with strategies are important.

- Steve Williams asked that when looking at the BICOP communities, in terms of the impacts and outcomes, was the whole population based on income also looked at. This would refer to something similar to low/moderate/above moderate levels. Mr. Oreschak noted specific study of income was not part of the study but part of the equity analysis was looking at equity focus areas combined with transit service use data. Mr. Oreschak will follow up with Mr. Williams on more information.
- Don Odermott expressed support of the policies, but had concerns about pushing more congestion into local grids where we bring more vehicles into contact with pedestrians, bicycles and transit service with safety hazards. The congestion pricing discussion reinforces the importance to improve our tools of modeling, with the need to dive deeper in the technology of modeling. Impacts resulting from diversion would be shown more clearly. Maps from the 2018 RTP were shown onscreen, used for this study. It was noted that if tools don't recognize the current congestion on freeways, then how much more diversion is likely to occur with insufficient modeling tools?

Ms. Ellis noted it is important to remember the definition of congestion is allowing for more congestions over a certain level of peak hours in certain sections. This contributes to the lack of congestion showing on the maps. It is important to not compare different definitions with measurements. Mr. Odermott noted that when this was flagged in the development of the RTP all we received was a simple statement that when a segment breaks down the maps do not then have the capability of reporting the implications of where the queues go back to. The RTP dramatically understates the time between destinations. Better modeling tools are needed.

- Karen Buehrig noted the presentation demonstrated that congestion results in several places within the RTP. We need to have a more consolidated, prominent place where it's discussed. The way it's set up now, there are multiple objectives related to congestion pricing. Being able to identify where that right place is would be helpful for this conversation, which may be in Chapter 8 of the RTP or perhaps earlier. The language and description, as earlier noted, is out of date, talking about what we were going to be doing in 2018 with different conditions. There should be a place to acknowledge the work of the Urban Mobility Office and the impact on our region with relationships of projects defined.

There needs to be more discussion on the congestion pricing funding regarding impacts and implications. In regard to congestion pricing along interstates, there are 2 reasons; a funding source and congestion management. These need to be talked about in the RTP and it needs to be clear in the funding section that this is seen as revenue source. If as a revenue source of funding to a project, and not identified as a certain project, it won't be built.

Mr. Oreschak noted more work is being done on this during the fall on the RTP financially constrained revenue forecast and RTP finance chapter, including congestion pricing assumptions and equitable financing background research. Ms. Buehrig noted that as we look at the funding strategy piece we look at it as a strategy for the whole system. We need to be engaged in this conversation about the funding, and acknowledge to the state itself we have a revenue source that is short of funding. To be able to achieve important funding of projects on

the interstate system this needs to be acknowledged in the RTP. A rational method of how money is raised and how spent is an important policy decision.

- Tara O'Brien noted the need for comprehensive discussion on congestion pricing policy, and within this policy we need to spell out the different interactions with State as revenue regarding to this different revenue mechanism. It was looked forward to hear more about the equity finance study work and how we tie this together from a tolling perspective where some of these decisions are being made at OTC. Additional comments in regards to transit and priorities and how congestion pricing can support this will be provided.
- Gareth Prior agreed on the clarification of terms and placement of language and specifics to help add definitions. It was suggested to not limit specifics in the policy development with expected revenues. Dollar allocations are not required at this time.

Adjournment (Chair Kloster)

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, April 20, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	04/20/2022	04/20/2022 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	042022M-01
2	Work Program	4/13/2022	MTAC work program as of 4/13/2022	042022M-02
3	Work Program	4/13/2022	TPAC work program as of 4/13/2022	042022M-03
4	Draft minutes	02/16/2022	Draft minutes from MTAC/TPAC Feb. 16. 2022 workshop	042022M-04
5	Presentation	4/7/2022	Regional mobility policy update Practitioner Forum #3	042022M-05
6	Memo	April 13, 2022	TO: TPAC, MTAC and interested parties From: Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Brief – Congestion Pricing Policy Development	042022M-06
7	Attachment 1	April 2022	Attachment 1 - Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Congestion Pricing Policy Overview April 2022	042022M-07
8	Attachment 2	July 2021	Metro Regional Congestion Pricing Study Final Report	042022M-08
9	Presentation	04/20/2022	Regional mobility policy update	042022M-09
10	Presentation	04/20/2022	RTP Congestion Pricing Policy Development	042022M-10