



# Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, December 15, 2021 | 9:30 a.m. to noon

Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

---

**Members, Alternates Attending**

**Affiliate**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Allison Boyd  
Chris Deffebach  
Eric Hesse  
Dayna Webb  
Jay Higgins  
Don Odermott  
Lewis Lem  
Jamie Stasny  
Peter Hurley  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Glen Bolen  
Carol Chesarek  
Tom Armstrong  
Colin Cooper  
Anne Debbaut  
Jeannine Rustad  
Heather Koch  
Tom Bouillion  
Darci Rudzinski  
Brett Morgan  
Kevin Cook  
Ryan Makinster  
Dr. Gerard Mildner  
Scot Siegel  
David Berniker  
Teresa Montalvo  
Steve Koper  
Martha Fritzie  
Laura Kelly  
Gordon Howard  
Shelly Parini  
Carrie Pak  
Ramsey Weit  
Roseann Johnson  
Brendon Haggerty  
Idris Ibrahim  
Mark Lear  
Erin Wardell  
Katherine Kelly

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
City of Portland  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
Port of Portland  
Clackamas County  
City of Portland  
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Multnomah County Citizen  
City of Portland  
City of Hillsboro  
Department Land Conservation and Development  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
North Clackamas Park & Recreation District  
Port of Portland  
Private Economic Development Organizations  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
Multnomah County  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Portland State University  
Largest City in Clackamas County: City of Lake Oswego  
Largest City in Multnomah County: Gresham  
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City  
Washington County: Other Cities: City of Tualatin  
Clackamas County  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
Clackamas County Water Environmental Services  
Tualatin Valley Water District  
Housing Affordability Organization Representative  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah County  
TPAC Community Representative  
City of Portland  
Washington County  
City of Vancouver

Theresa Cherniak  
**Guests Attending**

Sarah Iannarone  
Bob Kellett  
Chris Smith  
Barbara Fryer  
Lucia Ramirez  
Mike McCarthy  
Warren Schuyler  
Bill Holmstrom  
Kevin Young  
Mike Weston  
Eben Polk  
James Feldman  
Sarah Seldon  
Ted Labbe  
Susan Shanks  
Evan Manvel  
Kristin Greene  
Brian Hurley  
Brian Martin  
Ryan Dyar  
Ryan Marquardt  
Cody Meyer  
Cody Field  
Dan Pauly  
Darren Wyss  
Dave Roth  
Garet Prior  
Greg DiLoreto  
Hope Pollard  
Jessica Engelmann  
John Williams  
Mary Phillips  
Matt Crall  
Milwaukie Planning Staff  
Laura Terway  
Rachael Dawson  
Andrew Plambeck  
Tim Lynch

**Metro Staff Attending**

Ted Leybold, Planning Resource Manager  
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner  
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner  
Ted Reid, Principal Transportation Planner  
Eliot Rose, Tech Strategist & Planner  
Tim O'Brien, Principal Transportation Planner  
Marie Miller, TPAC & MTAC Recorder

Washington County  
**Affiliate**

The Street Trust  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
  
City of Cornelius  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Tualatin  
City of Tigard  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
City of King City  
Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Fairview  
UGI  
City of Tigard  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Beaverton  
City of Milwaukie  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
City of Tualatin  
City of Wilsonville  
City of West Linn  
City of Tigard  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
City of Tigard  
City of Beaverton  
City of West Linn  
City of Gresham  
Department Land Conservation & Development  
  
City of Happy Valley  
Cascade Policy  
Portland Streetcar  
Multnomah County

**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.

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** – none provided

**Consideration of MTAC/TPAC workshop summary of October 20, 2021** – no edits or corrections

**Workshop Purpose** (Kevin Young, Department Land Conservation & Development, DLCD) A brief overview of the workshop was provided. This workshop was planned to review current draft rules and gain feedback and suggestions on how these might be applied and implemented in the Portland region. It was noted significant work has already been addressed from the 2040 Growth Concept Metro has done. The DLCD Commission will review rule drafts beginning in March 2022, with May 22 adoption expected.

**Climate Friendly Rulemaking Updates** (Evan Manvel, DLCD) Mr. Manvel provided information on the background and purpose of the rulemaking. Oregon is not meeting its goals to reduce climate pollution. While some sectors have made significant progress, transportation related climate pollution has increased. If current trends continue, Oregon will come nowhere near to meeting our 2050 goal.

On March 10, 2020, Governor Kate Brown issued Executive Order 20-04, directing state agencies to reduce climate pollution. In response, the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) directed their staff to draft updates to Oregon's transportation and housing planning rules, and to convene a rulemaking advisory committee to help guide rule development. The rulemaking will significantly strengthen Oregon's rules about transportation and housing planning. Oregon is committed to increasing equity. Our state has a long history of discrimination and racism, including in our land use and transportation planning decisions. Rulemaking will focus on reducing pollution while also increasing housing choices and creating more equitable outcomes for all Oregonians.

Two categories of rulemaking are being drafted with performance monitoring and reporting under both. One is Regional Planning to meet pollution reduction targets. The second, under discussion at this workshop, are updated land use and transportation rules.

**Climate Friendly Areas** (Kevin Young, DLCD) As part of the Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities rulemaking, the DLCD is considering rules to facilitate the development of walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods in Oregon's eight metropolitan areas. Because the Portland Metro region has implemented similar requirements, with reference to Metro's adoption of the Climate Smart Strategy adopted by Metro Council in 2014, and incorporated through the Regional Transportation Plan, climate friendly area rules will operate differently in that region, reinforcing the region's Climate Smart Communities program.

Focus areas in the updated planning rules include:

- Climate-friendly areas - an area where residents, workers, and visitors can meet most of their daily needs without having to drive. They are urban mixed-use areas that contain, or are planned to contain,

a greater mix and supply of housing, jobs, businesses, and services. These areas are served, or planned to be served, by high quality pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure to provide frequent, comfortable and convenient connections to key destinations within the city and region.

- Reform parking management
- Support electric vehicle charging
- High quality pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure
- Go beyond focus on motor vehicle congestion standards
- Prioritize and select projects meeting climate/equity outcomes

Proposed requirements for the Portland Metro Region have been significantly revised:

- Metro to establish requirement for local government adoption of Region 2040 centers and land use regulations no later than December 31, 2024
- Local governments that have yet to do so shall comply by December 31, 2025
- Cities over 10,000 to report on affordable housing production, mitigation of displacement, and increasing housing choices within Region 2040 centers every six years

Kristin Greene shared the link to the RAC 10 packet with the most up to date draft rules:

[https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/LAR/Documents/2021-12-17\\_RAC\\_10\\_MeetingPacket\\_Part\\_1\\_.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/LAR/Documents/2021-12-17_RAC_10_MeetingPacket_Part_1_.pdf)

Comments from the committee:

- Greg DiLorento asked what cities over 10,000 were to report on regarding affordable housing production. Mr. Young noted that part of the housing production strategy to provide affordable housing involved city analysis for their housing needs, what requirements would be needed to boost housing production to meet those needs, and then submitting this report to DLCD for housing review process.
- Karen Buehrig asked for clarification in rules for other Metro jurisdictions with 30% future housing units within these climate friendly areas; were these each jurisdiction, or Metro-wide? Mr. Young noted neither applied to the Portland Metro region as they have already adopted the 2040 plan. There is no 30% requirement for the Metro region.
- Gerald Mildner asked what enforcement was planned if affordable housing was not planned per these requirements. Mr. Young noted the first step is working with local governments to produce what they can and provide assistance, but some level of enforcement would be made if resistance if found. When asked if cities that are producing affordable housing were getting market rate credit for doing so, Mr. Young noted these were all factored in, and the larger process is still under development.
- Tom Armstrong noted that all the 300 section including the alternative transportation review does not apply to the Metro cities. This leads us with a whole in terms of highway impact review, and planning for increasing density. It was noted under Section 130, the inequity analysis seems to have an overlap or backdoor for getting to issues with equity needs analysis. It was asked if more thought to direction on updates to Title 6 with better alignment, in how we get that alternative transportation review in there, how we look at activity levels, and more direction that just 'adopt boundary'.

Mr. Young noted that as the rules are currently written, the current draft would not allow for that alternative transportation review process, embedded in Section 0.325 of the draft rules. DLCD is open to input on how they can reinforce and support the Climate Smart and 2040

Growth Concept. Kristin Greene noted they are looking at possible extensions to the equity and climate smart work Metro has done, but respectful of not placing extra rules on the region with work already done.

**Parking Management and Electric Vehicle Charging** (Evan Manvel, DLCD) The presentation began noting that DLCD is considering updating parking rules in Oregon's eight metropolitan areas and supporting electric vehicle charging. It was noted that parking mandates force people who don't own or use cars to pay indirectly for other people's parking. Carless households tend to be the poorest households. Parking demand varies significantly from development to development; about one-sixth of Oregon renter households own zero vehicles. Rules should reflect that.

The proposed rules encourage the diversity of parking needs to be met by the diversity of development. The rules would reduce costly parking mandates for desired types of development, such as smaller housing types, small businesses, and historic buildings. Rules would also reduce mandates in certain areas, where parking demand is lower per unit: areas with a higher concentration of jobs and housing, and walkable areas well-served by transit.

The rules give communities options to improve parking management. Those who adopt best practice parking policies would get more flexibility. The rules require more populous cities do more management of on-street parking, through studying parking usage and using permits or meters to manage location or time-specific demand. Good parking management reduces how much non-drivers subsidize those who drive.

The rules address negative impacts of large parking lots by requiring lots be designed to be pedestrian-friendly and include either solar power or trees. The rules also would require 50% of new residential parking spaces be capable of electric vehicle charging (with conduit and electric capacity, but not yet wiring or chargers). Electric vehicles are a key part of meeting Oregon's climate pollution reduction goals.

Removing requirements to include parking in each development does not mean no parking will be built. Two decades of experience with lower parking mandates have demonstrated lender requirements and market dynamics usually result in parking being built. However, just like today's parking rules, cities must sometimes deal with "spillover" parking, and where more people are trying to park than spaces exist. This calls for improved management of on-street parking spaces, not one-size-fits-all mandates.

Comments from the committee:

- Ted Labbe provided support for the draft rules. The section on parking was especially important for developing climate adaptation, with opportunity to go farther to reintegrate infrastructure into climate strategies. Further comments from Urban Greenspaces Institute on the draft rules was shared via chat link: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZC-cfwJrBQ8wuuK3jW19cMReLdMDROPH/view?usp=sharing>
- Schuyler Warren added there are tax credits for EV charging infrastructure. These are limited but do help on costs with infrastructure. Its possible more subsidy funding statewide will be developed. One 2040 scenario in Tigard has removed all parking minimums due to financial

development challenges and the wish not to have as much parking. When cities get out of the way of parking requirements the market responds adequately to community needs.

- Glen Bolen asked if design issues were addressed in the draft rules. It was suggested to have standard polices across all jurisdictions using the lower volume, lower classifications when developing driveway, street and residential parking rules. Safety and access for pedestrians is a top issue with ODOT.
- Karen Buehrig asked what specifically will be applied in the Metro region and what decision making would be developed. Also, how do these rules interface with the RTP functional plan regarding parking and street designs there? Mr. Manvel noted the EV charging is expected to be widely applied in the Metro region. DLCD has had a series of meeting with Metro jurisdictions and staff with developing consideration of three options.

Kristin Greene noted the equity focus is important and be in compliance with parking rules from the mandates Mr. Manvel presented. Immediate validation in all regions by March 2023 is option 1. Option 2 is work with what Metro has on the books, commit with RTP updates and coordination. Option 3 is apply regulations/standards in the Metro area with current adoption of the framework plan to be applied by 2026. Urgency to enact climate rules was given by the Governor's order, to complete by 2024.

- Eric Hesse noted that more clarity on that second RTP-based option on parking could be helpful as the region discusses how we can move forward with all due urgency.
- Gerald Mildner asked about the EV mandate requirement for new development or all existing parking garages, and who pays for this. Mr. Manvel noted that as drafted, new development would have this requirement as retrofit for communities up to 50,000, or 20% of value. If the retrofit cost is over 20% value, this would apply as a cost exception.
- Mike McCarthy supported the goals to make bike/walk better options in neighborhoods. It was noted the challenges with traffic circling around blocks looking for available parking with extra pollution from vehicles. Mr. Manvel added cities struggle managing parking between free and convenient space, and those available, but all come with costs.
- Heather Koch asked how we are coupling parking reductions and management with secure transit access as well as ample funding for active transportation infrastructure. I'm thinking of major transit cuts at moment, and how a lot of great bond funding, etc. makes evident the overwhelming need for more active transportation investments.
- Don Odermott noted business areas want density, but if parking is priced inadequately it drives customers away. Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT) has increased with limited parking in urban development without transit options, which is not the same throughout the region.
- Barbara Fryer noted many residents in Cornelius have to drive to their location of work with limited transit options. It was encouraged that parking mandates be scaled via city size with amount of mass transit available.

**High Quality Pedestrian, Bicycle, Transit, and Street Infrastructure** (Bill Holmstrom, DLCD)

**Moving Beyond Motor Vehicle Congestion Standards** (Bill Holmstrom, DLCD)

**Prioritize and Select Projects meeting Climate and Equity Outcomes** (Bill Holmstrom, DLCD)

Bill Holmstrom presented information DLCD is considering updating rules guiding transportation and land use planning in Oregon's eight metropolitan areas.

Since 1991, the Transportation Planning Rules (TPR or OAR Chapter 660, Division 12) have set transportation planning requirements for all Oregon cities and counties. These rules are designed to ensure coordinated land use and transportation planning, that plans include all modes of transportation, and in metropolitan areas, that plans increase transportation choices and reduce reliance on the automobile.

It has become clear over the last decade that Oregon's existing rules are not sufficient to meet our Metropolitan Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets. To reduce climate pollution, local governments need to improve their plans so different land uses are more connected, encouraging a walkable mix of destinations and accelerating investments in walking, biking and transit. To achieve these objectives, LCDC is expected to update the state's transportation planning requirements for local transportation plans and will deliver additional health, equity, and economic benefits to residents of Oregon.

In collaboration with community service providers, planners and members of a Rules Advisory Committee, Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) staff are proposing amendments to existing rules, resulting in updated state and local plans that meet the state's greenhouse gas reduction goals. DLCD and other state agency partners including the Oregon Department of Transportation will provide a range of new and amplified services to local governments to help meet greenhouse gas reduction goals, including grants, technical assistance, tools, and publications, to help local governments adopt plans that meet or exceed the state's greenhouse gas reduction goals.

The amended rules would require local governments in metropolitan areas to:

- Plan for greater development in transit corridors and downtowns, where services are located and less driving is necessary;
- Prioritize system performance measures that achieve community livability goals;
- Prioritize investments for reaching destinations without dependency on single occupancy vehicles, including in walking, bicycling, and transit;
- Plan for and manage parking to meet demonstrated demand, and avoid over-building of parking in areas that need housing and other services;
- Plan for needed infrastructure for electric vehicle charging; and
- Regularly monitor and report progress.

The scope and scale of these requirements will vary by jurisdiction. The amendments will align with other state strategies to reduce transportation related climate pollution. Finally, it is important to note these amendments are intended to align with and support other priorities such as equity, safety, public health, and housing.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig noted the advantage to having regional plans to build on as helpful, but would this including competing guides with the Regional Functional Plan and how would requirements to comply be implemented between them? Inventories and requirements related to inventories are a concern, as well as ranking and tiered priorities. With different funding sources and ability to know the range of projects ranked and how they would specifically apply to our system planning effectively would be helpful.

Mr. Holmstrom noted the layers of requirements can be made clearer on how these fit with regional requirements of Metro. DLCD started this discussion focusing on state locations that didn't have what Metro has already established. It was noted the TPR applies to jurisdictions in the Metro area which will continue to be the underlying framework. Some specific rules talk about just the Portland area and gives some flexibility including inventories. DLCD encourages suggestions that result in making adjustments in the drafts.

- Erin Wardell noted that yes, Metro has been successful in the coordination with transportation planning. The way we do the financially constrained project list in the RTP work for our region. If asked do the financially constrained project lists at the regional level work with local jurisdictions lying on top of each other is questionable. They could have projects prioritized in a different way between RTP, County transportation systems, and City transportation plans. The interaction between all our transportation plans and ODOT needs to be addressed more specifically. We have some control over local jurisdiction but when you bring in the ODOT facilities and requirements to follow those standards potential for confusion and difficulties to untangle exist. It is possible some of the draft rules inadvertently tear apart what good coordination has already accomplished.
- Don Odermott noted from their recent presentation to the Hillsboro Council some takeaways. There was a vast inventory need for infrastructure, with 35-40% of that delivered by private sector, notably located in local streets. The other needs come from multimodal improvements, parks and trails. It has been noted system planning embracing walkable areas with sidewalks and bicycle facilities. It was noted that our ability to bring the development check list to the table requires a solid legal foundation, including the goal to close the gap with sidewalks and safety features between development areas. It was noted that retaining the performance measures was critical.
- Mike McCarthy noted hearing the different rules in the Portland area and how they would be implemented. It would help to have a document that outlined them. What would change in Metro from these rules? Mr. Holmstrom noted the difficulty with existing rules combined with regional function plan requirements. A check list developed from the most recent advisory committee could be provided, with future work with Metro staff helping put this together.
- Chris Deffebach noted that something like a crosswalk between existing METRO, TPR and new CFEEC would be helpful.
- Evan Manvel provided the link draft check list page starting on page 31 of the document: [https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/LAR/Documents/2021-12-17\\_RAC\\_10\\_MeetingPacket\\_Part\\_1\\_.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/LAR/Documents/2021-12-17_RAC_10_MeetingPacket_Part_1_.pdf)
- Erin Wardell noted the checklist in the packet is somewhat useful but really doesn't address these specific requirements of 'how' to do the transportation planning. It just says you have to amend your TSP to be compliant. We need to understand what compliance means.
- Eric Hesse noted a disconnect between RTP performance measures, that while yes, we are certified under climate smart, we are falling short on our gas reduction targets. These rules discussed with other plans need to consider the regional goals and process.
- Peter Hurly added From RTP performance monitoring, Appendix J, page 9: "The RTP...is not expected to meet regional policy targets for vehicle miles of travel, mode share and completion of the active transportation network by 2040, as shown in Chapter 7 of the plan."

- Cody Meyer noted the state was looking at reducing greenhouse emissions via VMT reduction targets for Metropolitan areas. Section 160 aims to connect new technology for actions taken beyond requirements. The various plans meeting targets are designed to be closely aligned with current processes and build on regional network framework, including the RTP.
- Karen Buehrig noted the need for more clarity within these goals about the organizations responsible. As Section 160 is written not, this is not clear. It was suggested to provide a table for the Metro area with identification on changes in the rules specifically.
- Gerald Mildner noted VMT targets have various elements of study, so may not provide consistency for targets. Some areas have limitation to transit for employment access in the region, forcing more people to drive cars. Planning new city formations and annexation areas with required mobility access can help make goals easier. It was suggested that changes in the UGB be contingent on goals. Everything in plans have effects and should be reviewed.
- Ted Labbe noted that if you look at unincorporated urban areas within the region the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> largest populations are unincorporated Washington and Clackamas Counties. Noting the need for green infrastructure it was asked how Metro could leverage investments and knowledge with the Parks & Nature department to coordinate climate strategies regionally.
- Kevin Young noted that green infrastructure requirements across the region would be challenging, and this focus of rulemaking applied to land use and transportation. DLCD is committed to provide resources after rulemaking to reach targets and beyond.

**Review Schedule, Wrap up, and Follow-up Survey** (DLCD and Metro staff) Bill Holmstrom presented details regarding upcoming rulemaking scheduled. The RAC will meet Dec. 17 to review revised rules including updated scenario planning rules. In January rule refinements and impact statement reviews will be made.

Presentations to LDCD will take place February through May, with more reviews on rules and impact statement, discussion on policy questions, public hearings and adoption. Opportunities for input was provided:

Non-Commission Input

- Complete Post-Meeting Survey
- Direct staff contact (email or phone) available on website
- Written testimony to Rulemaking Advisory Committee

Commission Input

- February 3, 2022
- First hearing March 31/Apr 1, 2022
- Adoption hearing May 19, 2022

The link to the follow up survey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/PractitionerMeetingsFollowUp>

Further consideration on input and written comments: [DLCD.CFEC@dlcd.oregon.gov](mailto:DLCD.CFEC@dlcd.oregon.gov)

**Adjournment** (Chair Kloster)

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, December 15, 2021

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	12/15/2021	12/15/2021 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	121521M-01
2	Memo	12/7/2021	TO: MTAC members and interested parties From: Marie Miller, Metro RE: 2022 Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) Meeting Schedule	121521M-02
3	Memo	12/7/2021	TO: TPAC members and interested parties From: Marie Miller, Metro RE: 2022 Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Meeting Schedule	121521M-03
4	Draft minutes	10/20/2021	Draft minutes from MTAC/TPAC Oct. 20, 2021 workshop	121521M-04
5	Meeting packet	March 22, 2021	Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities Rulemaking Advisory Committee MEETING 5	121521M-05
6	Meeting packet	Sept. 8, 2021	Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities Rulemaking Advisory Committee MEETING 8	121521M-06
7	Meeting packet	10/22/2021	Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities Rulemaking Advisory Committee MEETING 9	121521M-07
8	Meeting packet	12/6/2021	Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities Rulemaking Advisory Committee MEETING 10	121521M-08
9	Presentation	12/15/2021	Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities	121521M-09