

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

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

Date/time: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to noon

Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

Members, Alternates Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair, TPAC

Eryn Kehe, Chair, MTAC

Karen Buehrig

Jamie Stasny

Steve Williams

Allison Boyd

Sarah Paulus

Jessica Pelz

Dyami Valentine

Lynda David

Eric Hesse

Jaimie Lorenzini

Jay Higgins

Mike McCarthy

Tara O'Brien

Chris Ford

Glen Bolen

Laurie Lebowsky-Young

Lewis Lem

Bill Beamer

Sarah Iannarone

Indigo Namkoong

Katherine Kelly

Carol Chesarek

Tom Armstrong

Erik Olson

Colin Cooper

Aquilla Hurd-Ravich

Jessica Engelmann

Laura Terway

Gary Albrecht

Neelam Dorman

Kelly Reid

Manuel Contreas, Jr.

Cindy Detchon

Nina Carlson

Tom Bouillion

Fiona Lyon

Jerry Johnson

Brett Morgan

Sarah Radcliffe

Affiliate

Metro

Metro

Clackamas County

Clackamas County

Clackamas County

Multnomah County

Multnomah County

Washington County

Washington County

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council

City of Portland

City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County

City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County

City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County

TriMet

Oregon Department of Transportation

Oregon Department of Transportation

Washington State Department of Transportation

Port of Portland

TPAC Community Member at Large

The Street Trust

Verde

City of Vancouver

Multnomah County Representative, MTAC

Largest City in the Region: Portland

Largest City in Clackamas County: Lake Oswego

Largest City in Washington County: Hillsboro

Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City

Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton

Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley

Clark County

Oregon Department of Transportation

OR Department of Land Conservation & Development

Clackamas Water Environment Services

North Clackamas School District

NW Natural

Port of Portland

TriMet

Johnson Economics, LLC

1000 Friends of Oregon

Habitat for Humanity Portland Region

Members, Alternates Attending

Nora Apter
Aaron Golub
Rachel Loftin
Preston Korst
Erik Cole
Mike O'Brien
Craig Sheahan

Affiliate

Oregon Environmental Council
Portland State University
Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Revitalize Portland Coalition, Schnitzer Properties
Green Infrastructure, Mayer/Reed, Inc.
David Evans & Associates, Inc.

Guests Attending

Barbara Fryer
Bryan Graveline
Cassera Phipps
Chris Deffebach
Chris Faulkner
Dave Roth
Francesca Jones
Katie Dunham
Katie Selin
Max Nonnamaker
Melanie Moon
Schuyler Warren
Vanessa Vissar
Will Farley

Affiliate

City of Cornelius
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Clean Water Services
Washington County
Clean Water Services
City of Tigard
Portland Bureau of Transportation
North Clackamas Parks & Recreation District
Alta Planning & Design
Multnomah County
Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation District
City of Tigard
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Lake Oswego

Metro Staff Attending

Alex Oreschak, Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Daniel Audelo, Eliot Rose, Grace Stainback, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Molly Cooney-Mesker, Ted Leybold, Tim Collins

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

Tom Kloster, TPAC Chair, called the workshop meeting to order at 9:00 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.

Committee Updates

- Chris Ford announced a job opening at ODOT Region 1 for a Senior Planner for major projects. Applications are open until April 24. Contact Mr. Ford for further information.
- Laurie Lebowsky-Young announced a job opening at SW Washington Department of Transportation to be posted soon. This position is Engineer III in development review work.
- Eliot Rose noted the Climate and Emission Reduction Grants from EPA toward planning grants to Metro areas and states, to help identify implementation to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Rose will be following up to those that submitted applications through Metro for possible requests for more information and letters of support. The link on the grant program was shared: <https://www.epa.gov/inflation-reduction-act/climate-pollution-reduction-grants>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none provided

Consideration of MTAC/TPAC workshop summary of February 15, 2023 – No edits or corrections were submitted; summary of February 15, 2023 workshop approved as written.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan: Draft Chapter 3 (Policy) – Continue Discussion (Kim Ellis, Metro)

The revised working draft policy chapter was shared. Staff asked for further discussion on recommended draft policies before TPAC recommends to JPACT at their June 2 meeting on release of the draft 2023 RTP for public review, including Chapter 3. Revisions to draft Chapter 3 systems policies included pricing policy revisions, motor vehicle policy revisions, and mobility policy revisions. Additional comments may be submitted to Metro staff to May 3.

Comments from the committee:

- Laurie Lebowsky-Young noted changes in this version regarding auxiliary lanes language including adding or extending an auxiliary lane of more than one-half mile. It was asked if we are doing analysis to see if we're adding capacity. Ms. Ellis noted recent auxiliary lanes added and extended that go beyond the purpose of lanes between interchanges. Policies are intended to call out how they operate independently in the system. If they are not operating as such, we need to evaluate their capacity on the system.

It was asked when looking at urban areas where interchanges are located on/off the system, how do you ensure that where many interchanges are that may extend past the ½ mile. Ms. Ellis noted we need to be intentional about how this operates and work to get to planned capacity. It doesn't change any of the projects planned in the RTP but we will need to pay attention moving forward on future impacts.

CFEC language shared in chat: "The following types of proposed facilities must be reviewed as provided in this rule... New or extended auxiliary lanes with a total length of one-half mile or more. Auxiliary lane means the portion of the roadway adjoining the traveled way for speed change, turning, weaving, truck climbing, maneuvering of entering and leaving traffic, and other purposes supplementary to through-traffic movement."

Further shared in chat: From Chris Ford, ODOT, also in 0830... (b) Notwithstanding any provision in subsection (a), the following proposed facilities need not be reviewed or authorized as provided in this rule:

- (A) Changes expected to have a capital cost of less than \$5 million;
 - (B) Changes that reallocate or dedicate right of way to provide more space for pedestrian, bicycle, transit, or high-occupancy vehicle facilities;
 - (C) Facilities with no more than one general purpose travel lane in each direction, with or without one turn lane;
 - (D) Changes to intersections that do not increase the number of lanes, including implementation of a roundabout;
 - (E) Access management, including the addition or extension of medians;
 - (F) Modifications necessary to address safety needs; or
 - (G) Operational changes, including changes to signals, signage, striping, surfacing, or intelligent transportation systems.
- (c) To retain a proposed facility that is included in an existing acknowledged plan adopted as provided in OAR 660-012--0015, a city or county shall review that facility under this rule at the time of a major update to its transportation system plan.

Kelly Reid, DLCD added the amendment that LCDC is considering tomorrow would exempt some capacity-increasing projects from the additional review - namely, projects that are further along in design/development and projects included in voter-approved bonds.

Ms. Lebowsky-Young asked in terms of the projects already in the RTP would this new policy apply. Ms. Ellis noted it would not apply to projects in the 2018 RTP already programmed. New projects brought forward would need to look at the context of the policy and apply those policies in subsequent plans. Asked about concern to this new policy added just 5 days ago, it was asked if enough time for people to comment was given. Ms. Ellis noted there will be a 45-day comment period this summer and the committee will review again before recommending to JPACT with revisions proposed and discussed.

- Karen Buehrig appreciated the conversation where and when these policies are applied. If auxiliary lanes fell into this category and was going into the MTIP, would policies applied to projects being brought into the MTIP that were not initially in the RTP, such as auxiliary lanes? Ms. Ellis noted for a project to be in the MTIP it needs to be in the RTP. Amendments can be made to the RTP for further projects if needed.

Ms. Buehrig noted that regarding the mobility policy there was interest in learning from the analysis Metro was doing on projects and if any changes or adjustments should be made to the mobility policy. Are we discussing this now or have a planned separate discussion around the implementations of this in the RTP. Ms. Ellis noted we don't have the system results yet and are still working on the modeling work. The state and Metro are working on VMT per capita analysis. Time is needed to study both works. It is expected to have information to share later this summer.

- Eric Hesse noted that in terms of project management process areas to look at for changes could be in policy 3.4 or chapter 8 of the RTP. More clarification around what's new and rules that apply could be worked in. Pricing policies around parking were noted as good solutions. It was asked why pricing policy language was not included in policy 9? Ms. Ellis noted this was intentional based on discussions at the last meeting. There are still questions on where parking pricing would apply. Interest in including parking pricing can be reconsidered with language placed back in.

Mr. Hesse noted the importance of the pricing study that led to these policies and the framework that was developed. It was asked why language on pricing policy 1 investments was removed. Ms. Ellis noted the focus was defining the outcomes rather than deciding the "how". Clarifications were asked on the changes in the transit policies. Ally Holmqvist noted the High Capacity Transit workgroup was meeting later today for further discussions. Track changes in the draft were in response to comments received on transit policies. Specific language changes were described.

- Mike McCarthy shared a perspective with data on from the last 10 years that showed how increased serious crashes between cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles lead to policies that aimed to make biking and walking safer while balancing travel mode systems that made driving less attractive and using transit. Recently the bike share mode has dropped from 7.2% to 2.7% with crash rates significantly increasing and discouragement to come to the downtown area, which

hurts for a vital regional center. It was questioned policy wise if more costly and capacity restrictive policies on our system was recommended.

- Jessica Pelz appreciated Metro taking comments and including them in the draft. Questions were raised on implementing the mobility policy section. It was noted it says system planning also includes concept plans for designated and urban reserve areas, which Washington County does a lot of. The Urban System Functional Plan does not clearly state what the network system needs to have and getting an adequate collector network to work in these urban reserve areas while planning at the concept level and carrying that forward to the community plan is challenging. It was asked how implementation of greenfield areas on the edge of planning with high density and mass transit is planned in ways that reduce VMT in these policies. Is analysis being planned on density in the UGB areas?

Ms. Ellis noted the regional functional plan aligned with the RTP and state functional plan for urban planning. Before the concept plan is completed the transit infrastructure and system management plan need to be understood and analyzed how it is expected to perform. The evaluation process will be done by local governments and Metro. Ms. Pelz noted the community plan is treated more as a vision in going forward with all the networks. Planning and modeling is more challenging when looking at the collector networks individually or as whole. Ms. Ellis noted these should be adopted into a TSD.

It was asked how the implementation of quasi-judicial amendments work in practice where the small-scale amendments need to demonstrate where the proportion impacts conditions. There is concern on issues of proportionality and how we make conditions meet requirements. It was noted that local governments have adopted plans based on system completeness.

- Chris Ford appreciated the staff work on chapter 3. Big changes were noted. The policy on auxiliary lanes was still being reviewed, with ODOT following up with a letter. An earlier letter sent by ODOT was in the packet related to the mobility policy. Responses from staff was appreciated. ODOT likes some of the pricing policy adjustments but remains concerned over policy action that provides JPACT directing agencies how to spend revenues. It was noted the RTP should be consistent on regional and state goals with language and tone adjustments.

In terms of the resilience policies, concern with policy 6 on VMT per capita should be consistent with policy 1 so no confusion is given with gas emission reduction targets. The emergency transportation routes are good but should be placed in a different location other than climate or resiliency. In terms of the motor vehicle network, it was appreciated Metro storing the planned system language and providing clarity what the planned system means. It was agreed arterial and freeway policies are different and noted as such. In the glossary, the term capacity should either be cited in the RTP or defined with all other language pertaining to this.

- Karen Buehrig looked forward to further discussions at the May 10 TPAC workshop. It was noted the 3-27 map (Regional Transit Map) was hard to read. It was suggested to take out employment and industrial areas in the central cities area. It's also hard to distinguish HCT on this map which could be shown on a separate map. Transit can be fluid between current time and what TriMet's Forward Together is planning. It was anticipated more discussion would be help on the HCT map and HCT policies at the workshop.

- Laurie Lebowsky-Young agreed with the opportunity to provide more context on the auxiliary lane policies. Interest in learning how this interacts between states with individual transportation plans relating to auxiliary lanes.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan: Project list summaries and draft high-level assessment results

(Eliot Rose, Metro) Information was presented on summarizing the 2023 RTP project list, as well as draft results from the high-level assessment of how projects advance regional goals and from the system analysis of the RTP. Over the next several months, Metro staff will be sharing three different types of information that can help to understand the plan's investments and impacts:

- **RTP project list summaries**, which include aggregate information such as the distribution of projects across different types of investments and different cost categories. These summaries provide information on the spending profile of the RTP as well as context to help understand the two other types of information discussed below.
- The **high-level assessment**, which takes a simple, yes-or-no approach to reviewing whether individual RTP projects have certain features that support RTP goals, and on the share of the RTP budget devoted to different types of projects.
- The **system analysis**, which is a quantitative evaluation of how the RTP performs with respect to specific performance measures and targets that reflect RTP goals and policies.

The project list uses the following characteristics to understand the RTP's investment profile and priorities: by investment scenario, by investment category, and by cost category. The high-level assessment includes ten measures – two for each of the five RTP goal areas (Equity, Climate, Safety, Mobility, and Economy). Each measure asks a simple yes-or-no question that can be answered using maps and analyses from the RTP and the information that lead agencies submit through the RTP call for projects. Metro staff applied the assessment to each of the capital projects and programmatic investments in the RTP to create the draft results.

The draft system analysis results cover system completeness and safety performance measures.

Findings include:

- The motor vehicle network is significantly more complete than other modal networks.
- In many parts of the region that the RTP prioritizes for investment – including 2040 centers and mixed-use areas, equity focus areas, and near transit stations – active transportation networks are currently more complete than they are in the region as a whole.
- The RTP completes the bike and pedestrian network along arterials slightly more quickly than in the rest of the region.
- The RTP does not appear to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle investments in equity focus areas, near transit, nor in most areas prioritized for employment growth.
- The region is not on track to meet its Vision Zero safety targets.
- Though bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is more complete in equity focus areas (EFAs) than in other communities, a higher percent of crashes are still occurring in EFAs.

Note: Chair Kloster left the meeting. The Chair position was then filled by MTAC Chair Eryn Kehe.

Comments from the committee:

- Nina Carlson asked how regional diversity engagement was done and what the criteria was. Molly Cooney-Mesker noted that the survey is being promoted region-wide. We are monitoring participation and increasing promotion in geographic areas with lower participation. In terms of recent and upcoming engagement, we are working with seven community based

organizations who are engaging under-represented communities across the region. We worked with community engagement liaisons to hold language-specific forums last week. We held a community leaders forum and there is an upcoming business leader forum in May, both of which are reaching leaders across the three counties. There will also be an online comment survey during the public comment period this summer, that we will also share region-wide. In the next couple weeks, we will start sharing out the input from recent engagement. Interest was noted in the geographic representation of where outreach is done, and where folks that participated reside. Asked if stipends were offered for participation, this was confirmed.

Ms. Carlson asked, on the roads and bridges, what portion was increased capacity, what is improvement, and does BRT or bus on shoulder improvements come under transit or under R and B. Lake McTighe noted BRT projects are identified as BRT in the project title, and as Transit Capital in the investment category. We can also report back on what percentage of road and bridge projects increase capacity, as we did collect project information on that. Additionally, in the project list there is a question "Project adds a vehicle lane of any type" that identifies projects that add capacity. There do not appear to be any bus on shoulder projects in the draft RTP project list.

- Eric Hesse noted the results with equity and climate categories in thinking how the cost element plays out, especially focused on the cost expenditures when given the different project mix. It was suggested to consider evaluating costs vs number of projects when planning investments. It was noted the challenges with large projects to measure climate and equity (IBR as an example). Also challenging related to climate and equity focus areas with transit service.

Mr. Rose noted the reason transit service is placed under Roads & Bridges is that usually service is operating a route we already want to have in place. It's not changing the location of service or amount of service, but what impacts the RTP goals. The RTP invests a higher share of long-term resources in equity focus areas and projects on the high injury network. This could represent opportunities to prioritize equity and safety in near-term investments.

Mr. Hesse noted just to underscore the transit service piece, looks like it constitutes 58% of the \$48B of O&M expenditure, which is \$27.8B of investment -- more than all of the capital spending in the plan combined (\$25.3B), so feels pretty significant to figure out how to relate to our outcomes.

- Karen Buehrig noted the difficulty to describe transit service. It was important to note that transit service and continued transit service within operations are supporting different communities and different equity areas and helping us achieve our goals. The operation side to transit continues transit service. It was acknowledged on the focus of regional analysis to understand what is happening in each county but suggested to add "and its jurisdictions". Some jurisdictions do not have equity areas that report on achieving equity goals which here are regionally defined. Others are addressing investment needs of local communities which could be a limited way of addressing equity in funding projects. It was asked if anticipated the committee will provide a directive on recommendations with projects. Ms. Ellis noted it won't be a directive but continued conversation to gain input and ideas on meeting goals and development of the RTP, which adds more insight into the plan for JPACT and Metro Council.

- Jaimie Lorenzini noted changing the project levels with different project elements and designs may require more Metro help of support to local jurisdictions. Under the high-level assessment draft findings, it was noted the RTP invests a higher share of long-term resources in equity focus areas on projects on the high injury network. This could represent opportunities to prioritize equity and safety in near term investments. It was asked if it could be cross walked between long term vs near term investments. By implementations, how do you see the RTP prioritizing those certain types of investments in the application?

Mr. Rose noted that 60% of long term goes to projects on the high injury network and 40% goes to projects in the near-term investments on the high injury network. Both are shares of the budget and are ways the RTP can prioritize them. Lake McTighe added I would like to clarify, that just because a project is on the High Injury Corridors, it does not necessarily mean the project is a safety project. For safety projects, I would also like to clarify that a high-level review of the projects revealed that some nominating agencies identified some projects as safety projects that did not meet the definition included in the project solicitation guide. Metro does not have capacity to assess each project, so expanded the definition to include projects that "provide some other benefit to safety."

- Dyami Valentine cautioned to think about when putting in these projects some of these are very conceptual and different from the designed standpoint with level of detail that describe outcomes and projected benefits. Caution should be noted on categorizing with differentiations between percentages. Appreciation to understand further opportunities to amend our project lists to move forward from these project levels. Mr. Rose noted there were some refinements requested from the 2018 RTP based on similar results in safety. It was recommended to capture the outcomes and benefits projected. Changes in descriptions are the most common changes being made.

2024-27 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Region 1: 100% project lists and public comment (Chris Ford, Oregon Department of Transportation) Mr. Ford began the presentation with an overview of what the STIP was, the three phases of STIP Development, and investments in the '24-'27 STIP:

- More than \$3 billion in total state and federal resources
- Significant infusions from both HB 2017 and federal infrastructure bill
- Major investment of federal and state funding in bridges
- Significant increase in funding for public and active transportation
- Increased funding for safety
- Greater investments in local government programs
- Investment in ADA curb ramps

The 2024 – 2027 STIP Program Funding Categories include:

FIX-IT (35%) Projects that preserve or fix the state highway system– bridges, pavement, culverts, etc.
 SAFETY (6%) Projects focused on reducing fatal and serious injury crashes on Oregon's roads
 ENHANCE HIGHWAY (7%) Highway projects that expand or enhance the state highway system
 PUBLIC AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (11%) Bicycle, pedestrian, public transportation and transportation options projects & programs
 LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS (19%) Funding to cities, counties, and others for priority projects
 ADA CURB RAMPS (11%) Construction of curb ramps to make sidewalks accessible for people experiencing a disability

OTHER FUNCTIONS (11%) Workforce development, planning, data collection and other programs using federal money

Region 1 Draft 100% List As of February 2023

Category	Amount
ADA	\$164.4 m
Bridge	\$311.3 m
ARTS	\$41.7 m
Ped Bike	\$27.5 m
Preservation	\$22.1 m
Operations	\$25.8 m
Enhance	\$15.9 m
Various other	\$21.5 m
Total	\$630 million

It was noted a *new* Construction Reserve approach was planned for cost escalation pressures that have made it more challenging to accurately estimate construction costs, to help address, some funding categories are using a pooled reserve for construction funds, and ODOT will be able to better distribute construction funds after preliminary engineering, and closer to bid. Details were provided of projects by category. Mr. Ford encouraged questions and input on any of the STIP information with his contact information provided.

Adjournment (Eryn Kehe, MTAC Chair)

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by MTAC Chair Kehe at 11:58 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, April 19, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	4/19/2023	4/19/2023 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	041923M-01
2	Work Program	4/12/2023	MTAC work program as of 4/12/2023	041923M-02
3	Work Program	4/12/2023	TPAC work program as of 4/12/2023	041923M-03
4	Draft Minutes	2/15/2023	Draft minutes from February 15, 2023 MTAC TPAC workshop	041923M-04
5	Memo	April 11, 2023	TO: MTAC, TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan – Revised Draft Chapter 3 (System Policies)	041923M-05
6	Attachment 1	4/11/2023	DRAFT: Chapter 3 System Policies to Achieve Our Vision 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	041923M-06
7	Attachment 2	N/A	2023 RTP Glossary of Terms	041923M-07
8	Attachment 3	4/7/2023	Comparison of Revenue and Rate Setting Policies: 2023 RTP Update Draft Pricing Policies and OHP Policy 6	041923M-08
9	Attachment 4	N/A	TPAC/MTAC comments on March Draft of 2023 RTP Ch. 3	041923M-09
10	Attachment 5	March 30, 2023	Project Timeline and Schedule of Engagement and Metro Council and Regional Advisory Committees' Discussions and Actions for 2023	041923M-10
11	ODOT Letter to TPAC	N/A	TO: TPAC From: Chris Ford, ODOT RE: Letter to TPAC regarding the RTP	041923M-11
12	Memo	April 19, 2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Draft 2023 RTP project list summaries, high-level assessment results, and system analysis results	041923M-12
13	Appendix A	4/5/2023	Graphic project list and high-level assessment summaries	041923M-13
14	Appendix B	4/19/2023	Subregional results	041923M-14
15	Appendix C	4/19/2023	High-level assessment methodology	041923M-15
16	Presentation	4/19/2023	Draft 2024-2027 STIP Update	041923M-16
17	Presentation	4/19/2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Revised Draft Chapter 3 – System Policies	041923M-17

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
18	Presentation	4/19/2023	2023 draft RTP project summaries and high-level assessment results	041923M-18