



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to noon

Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

Members, Alternates Attending

Affiliate

Tom Kloster, Chair, TPAC

Metro

Eryn Kehe, Chair, MTAC

Metro

Karen Buehrig

Clackamas County

Jamie Stasny

Clackamas County

Steve Williams

Clackamas County

Allison Boyd

Multnomah County

Adam Barber

Multnomah County

Jessica Pelz

Washington County

Dyami Valentine

Washington County

Theresa Cherniak

Washington County

Judith Perez

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council

Eric Hesse

City of Portland

Tom Armstrong

City of Portland

Jaimie Lorenzini

City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County

Dayna Webb

City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County

Will Farley

City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County

Laura Terway

Clackamas County: Other Cities, Happy Valley

Jay Higgins

City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County

Mike McCarthy

City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County

Gregg Snyder

City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County

Colin Cooper

Largest City in Washington County, Hillsboro

Jessica Engelmann

Second Largest City in Washington County, Beaverton

Miranda Bateschell

Washington County: Other Cities, Wilsonville

Tara O'Brien

TriMet

John Serra

TriMet

Fiona Lyon

TriMet

Chris Ford

Oregon Department of Transportation

Neelam Dorman

Oregon Department of Transportation

Glen Bolen

Oregon Department of Transportation

Gerik Kransky

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Lewis Lem

Port of Portland

Tom Bouillion

Port of Portland

Laura Kelly

Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development

Kelly Reid

Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development

Manuel Contreras, Jr.

Clackamas Water Environmental Services

Chris Faulkner

Clean Water Services

Cassera Phipps

Clean Water Services

Gery Keck

Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District

Heather Koch

North Clackamas Park & Recreation District

Nina Carlson

NW Natural

Jerry Johnson

Johnson Economics, LLC

Bret Marchant
Brett Morgan
Nora Apter
Rachel Loftin
Preston Korst
Erik Cole
Dr. Gerard Mildner
Mike O'Brien
Craig Sheahan
Andrea Hamberg
Brendon Haggerty
Ryan Ames
Bill Beamer
Ellie Gluhosky
Sarah Iannarone
Danielle Maillard
Jasia Mosley
Joseph Edge
Kamran Mesbah
Victoria (Vee) Paykar
Victor Saldanha
Faun Hosey

Guests Attending

Alex Gilbertson
Anne Ke
Ariel Kane
Austin Barnes
Barbara Fryer
Bryan Graveline
Chris Smith
Cody Meyer
Jonathan Slason
Justin Sherrill
Kiel Jenkins
Madeline Baron
Max Nonnamaker
Nick Chun
Schuyler Warren
Shane Valle
Stu Peterson
Tia Williams
Vanessa Vissar
Zoie Wesenberg

Metro Staff Attending

Alicia Wood, Ally Holmqvist, Andre Bealer, Cassie Salinas, Cindy Pederson, Daniel Audelo, Eliot Rose, Eryn Kehe, Grace Cho, Grace Stainback, Jeffrey Hood, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Madeline Steele, Marie Miller, Matt Bihn, Sebrina Owens-Wilson, Ted Leybold, Ted Reid, Thaya Patton, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster

Greater Portland, Inc.
1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon Environmental Council
Community Partners for Affordable Housing
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Schnitzer Properties, Revitalize Portland Coalition
Portland State University
Mayer/Reed, Inc.
David Evans & Associates, Inc.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah County
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah County
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington County
TPAC Community Member at Large
OPAL Environmental Justice in Oregon
The Street Trust
Oregon Walks
TPAC Community Member at Large
Clackamas County Representative, MTAC
Clackamas County Representative, MTAC
Multnomah County Representative, MTAC
Washington County Representative, MTAC
Washington County Representative, MTAC

Affiliate

North Clackamas Parks & Recreation District

City of Portland
Marion County
City of Cornelius
Portland Bureau of Transportation

Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
RSG
EcoNorthwest

EcoNorthwest
Multnomah County
EcoNorthwest
City of Tigard
City of Portland
Macadam Forbes
WSP
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

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

- Tara O'Brien announced the MAX Red Line between the Gateway Center and Airport has shut down for upgrades. Shuttle service is offered. Red Line Project: <https://trimet.org/alerts/2023/index.htm> It was announced TriMet has added two new board members: Tyler Frisbee and Robert Kellogg. Summer transit youth service passes are now available.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none provided

Consideration of MTAC/TPAC workshop summary of April 19, 2023 – No edits or corrections were submitted; summary of April 19, 2023 workshop approved as written.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Updated system performance and climate analysis (Eliot Rose, Metro) The presentation began noting two issues now facing the region that were not accounted for in previous RTP updates; The transit system is facing significant challenges, including recovering from severe service and ridership declines due to the COVID-19 pandemic, ongoing challenges hiring drivers, concerns about riders' and drivers' safety, and inflationary increases in the cost of new infrastructure and service, and this will be the first RTP to include significant road pricing. Previous work by Metro shows that pricing can be very effective at advancing the region's mobility, climate and equity goals – as long as pricing programs are carefully designed to maximize these outcomes.

These issues have impacts on all five regional goals, but they are particularly visible in the RTP climate analysis, which considers how transit and pricing work together to help meet the region's greenhouse gas reduction targets using tools that make it easy to estimate how different combinations of transit and pricing impact emissions and is allowed to assume additional pricing mechanisms that are not captured in the RTP.

System analysis results described RTP transit investments and their impact on performance. The RTP continues to grow the transit network, but the nature of that service changes, focusing more on frequent service throughout the day, particularly in equity focus areas, and less on serving peak hour commute trips. The RTP continues to make significant investments in transit service. These investments help to advance the region's mobility, climate and equity goals.

Analysis on how tolling is included in the RTP and impacts on system performance was presented. Tolling's impact on regional goals and performance measures is expected to reduce total regional vehicle miles traveled, reduce congestion on I-5 and I-205 without significantly increasing delay on parallel arterials, likely encourage people to shift when they travel, and likely lead to an increase in carpooling.

The presentation provided more detail on how state-led pricing and regional climate strategies contribute to meeting climate targets. Scenarios presented with assumptions and results, and target assumptions and results were shown. The region meets its targets by assuming a combination of STS

pricing and reinvestment of revenues in other climate strategies. Lessons from this analysis:

- There are multiple paths to meeting climate targets through a combination of additional STS pricing and other strategies.
- It will likely take additional pricing and other actions beyond what is included in the 2023 RTP for the region to meet its climate targets.
- The region can meet its climate targets while also advancing mobility and equity goals if revenues from new pricing programs are reinvested in other GHG reduction strategies.

These findings can help to guide Metro and its partners in advocating for pricing that benefits the region as the state takes steps to implement STS pricing. They do not:

- Change the results of the RTP climate analysis.
- Identify specific transit projects for additional funding.

Comments from the committee:

- Jerry Johnson noted the pandemic was temporary, but the shifts in employment patterns is likely to be more persistent. Is this being included in the modeling? Mr. Rose noted calibrations from the transit data from the pandemic period were an odd time for the transit system. Telework is something we are paying more attention to post-pandemic. The climate analysis shared had background assumptions on what future levels of telework might look like and effects on gas emissions in the region. This is an ongoing effort to account for changing dynamics.
- Sarah Iannarone asked if Metro is using tolling and congestion pricing interchangeably here. Mr. Rose noted tolling refers to collecting a toll at a certain location. Pricing can take other forms such as charging per mile fees and collecting other transportation revenues.
- Mike McCarthy asked to see the data to back up these assertions about the effects of tolling - particularly the 'not increasing delay on parallel routes'. This is a concern with tolling of diverting traffic off tolling facilities onto local streets, safety impacts and livability with crosswalks. Mr. Rose noted isolating the impacts on these tolling projects with quantitative data is challenging and will follow up with the modeling team on what's possible.

It was noted earlier modeling was not able to convert a price to change in travel patterns. They used an estimated travel time distance so instead of modeling a \$2 toll, it was a delay in number of certain minutes. It was suggested the same approach be used rather than use the price to change the behavior it takes of certain number of delays. Mr. Rose noted more of the analysis will get at the details of each project with data such as this.

- Michael O'Brien asked for clarification on slide 19: Target scenarios – key assumptions, that lists pricing 2 cents less when combined with transit (target 2). Mr. Rose noted in our climate smart strategy both pricing and transit are high-impact strategies used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In these scenarios they can work together to support the reduction of emissions. If using just pricing to reach targets, you have to charge more than if you use the combined pricing and transit investments which offers travel options, allowing less required pricing.
- Vanessa Vissar noted the assumptions for rates for different congestion pricing, tolling and road usage charge programs are preliminary. We still have a lot of analysis to do to develop and establish what the rates for these projects would be – however, these are helpful guiding assumptions for the analysis of how road pricing contributes to regional goals.
- Bill Beamer noted reports are suggesting car ownership reaching lower rates for older generations and asked if this was factored into the assumptions for transit forecasts as we go out to 2045. Mr. Eliot noted the most recent data available on transit is calibrated and

recalibrated every 5 years with the model. Car ownership data may shift with changes to transit. Tara O'Brien noted in terms of transit services contained in the constrained RTP networks small increases of transit each year based on ridership were forecast. TriMet is embarking on Forward Together 2.0 which will look beyond what we currently estimate for growth.

- Jaimie Lorenzini asked about the relationship between pricing and mode shift that was mentioned. Was there data that explored the strength of this relationship? Mr. Rose noted the details on the analysis need to be followed up. Neelam Dorman noted ODOT will check with their modelers for more information as well.
- Tara O'Brien asked for confirmation on the financially constrained investment being analyzed for the RTP now, with future development of strategic investments when more funding is known. Ms. Ellis noted modeling on future investments has not been done yet but good to think about future strategic investments. It was noted the lessons from the analysis can help to guide Metro and its partners in advocating for pricing that benefits the region as the state takes steps to implement STS pricing.
- Karen Buehrig noted the importance of our transit system as essential to reaching climate goals. Figures 1, 2 and 3 were noted that showed how the RTP transit network evolves over time by presenting side-by-side maps of the 2020, 2030 and 2045 networks. It was disappointing to note the lack of investments in Clackamas County with little frequent service lines, and difficulty of mode share when shifting trips to reach destinations that increase their travel times.

The Better Bus was not seen in the plans by 2045. It was hoped the tiering related to HCT may include the Better Bus but not sure. It was asked what jurisdictional staff could do better. The action we have been taking has not been reflected in these strategies with the regional plan. The memo notes transit needs to provide frequent service, connect destinations to jobs and housing, and serve focus equity areas. If transit lines are not existing for them it will be difficult to achieve goals. Chapter 8 shows several transit planning projects. A better connection with these project goals needs to be defined to improve mode share.

It was noted the statement in the memo that read "The anticipated diversion to parallel arterials is not expected to produce substantial additional delay on arterials since most diversion is expected to occur in the off-peak periods, when arterials have excess capacity" is incorrect. For the jurisdictions that have the benefit of the deeper analysis done on the I-205 process that was not proven. The analysis shows additional delay. Missing is the impact on safety with moving more vehicles onto roads that perhaps may not have the same safety features needed for pedestrians and cyclists. Words from the memo moved into Chapter 7 is a concern.

It was good to note the Statewide Strategy with the Road User Charge which will play a significant role in transportation investment. It will be important to clearly define next steps with tolling and pricing in Chapter 8. More conversations on moving from analysis to action plans is needed for Chapter 8.

- Dyami Valentine fully supported Karen's comments. We need to have a broader discussion around pricing policy. The pricing policies in Ch. 3 needs to reflect revenue generation as an objective. Discussion around how these revenues can be spent is essential to advancing the

initiative, including investments in throughway as well as other roadway investment priorities, in addition to increasing other travel options.

- Gregg Snyder noted with discussions around mode shifts the models that track changes with business around lodging, retail, restaurants and travel in the region may be off. Thinking of this through the lens of the matrix of downtown Portland since the pandemic which has not increased to the same pre-pandemic level. To whatever extent we can model these elements would be helpful.
- Eric Hesse noted the transit rider projections rising steeply seemed like a massive change in expectation. Is this because pricing is assumed to be generating much more ridership? In terms of scenario development it seem to appear we can take tolling and pricing revenues and put them in service growth. Does that assume a change in our competition? It was noted capital investments are needed to create the service increase. There is a concern with being comfortable with the level of uncertainty of VMT per capita for the next 20 years.

Matt Bihn noted the way Metro reflects the tolling model is not so much delayed times total but translating tolls into travel time penalties at certain spots. The tolls we assumed in the RTP were the best we knew in early April, but know they will change as new data emerges. It was noted there are no mitigations in what we model in the results of what we toll.

- Neelam Dorman acknowledged the earlier comments from Vanessa Vissar with ODOT. The agency is working on analysis of pricing projects and revenues and will be updating their financial plans as new information becomes known.
- Gregg Snyder noted that from a technical standpoint as you proceed with the curve shown in Figure 6 that represent demand, it was suggested to add the supply. We have an increasing population in employment that will help tell the story. It does appear to be a pricing exercise when we add transit to pricing, but what's driving it; pricing or massive increase in transit service. It was suggested to split the transit out and show this on a separate line. It was noted the VMT is a great target but graphics showing geographic areas are unclear what is covered in the number of counties. Outside the Portland area VMT gas emissions are rising and may be offsetting gains. Mr. Rose added the analysis is limited to the Metro boundary, and we used VisionEval, not MOVES for that analysis, as required by the RTP regs and the process the state has set up.
- Joseph Edge asked if we can we see a chart showing total GHG for the region at different touchstone points on the way to the target year, including the base year (1990)? Are we actually reducing total GHG emissions for the target year when we consider population increases? Mr. Rose noted these two resources provide the type of information you're looking for, though neither is 100% a fit. <https://regionalbarometer.oregonmetro.gov/pages/climate-mitigation> <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/transportation-system-monitoring-daily-vehicle-miles-travel>
- Joseph Edge noted maybe the RTP should connect planned transit investments to objective goals for transit-supportive land use policy implementation or development patterns, so jurisdictions like Clackamas County will know what is expected of them before seeing transit investments prioritized. The HCT plan provides some detail on this for HCT specifically, but it could be extended for the RTP to apply to other types of investments.
- Ally Holmqvist noted we were just talking about providing more detail (a checklist) for HCT specifically as a next step and thinking about how we can include exactly this as a takeaway from the Access to Transit study.

2024 Urban Growth Management Decision: Housing market filtering and displacement trends (Ted Reid, Metro, Madeline Baron, Justin Sherrill and Nick Chun, EcoNorthwest) Ted Reid began the presentation with an overview on the project that will set the stage for upcoming growth management decisions (particularly the 2024 urban growth management decision) and help Metro more deeply integrate market realities, infrastructure, governance needs, and equity into those decisions.

Madeline Baron provided background and information on house filtering and market functions. In recent decades, many markets have been underproducing housing with big consequences. Housing underproduction correlates with:

- Homelessness via price increases and reduced vacancies
- Greenhouse gasses and vehicle miles traveled
- Homeownership disparities by race and ethnicity
- Economic and racial segregation

Markets need to meet future need (new households arriving/forming) AND existing need (units for people experiencing homelessness, units for households who are cost burdened).

At the regional level, new housing supply impacts prices and rents via the supply elasticity and via filtering. Supply elasticity is the relationship between changes in market supply and average market prices:

- Bringing housing supply in line with demand helps to moderate price and rent increases; areas with too much supply will see prices/rents fall
- Supply elasticity requires 100,000's of units to reduce average prices statewide
- Building this many units would induce demand and restore price equilibrium – muting the impacts on price

Via filtering, national research¹ estimates that housing depreciates:

- 2.37% - 2.71% per year for rental
- 0.49% - 0.58% per year for ownership

Filtering will never lead to housing prices/rents becoming affordable to very low income households. Housing for these households will always need public subsidy. Filtering takes a long time and can move in reverse when a regional housing market is undersupplied. Research and opinions are mixed on how new housing supply impacts the prices/rents of existing housing at the local level but personal experiences, neighborhood change, and cultural displacement are real.

Comments from the committee:

- Fiona Lyon asked how much existing housing stock is subsidized? Someone asked us this the other day and I didn't have any statistical data at my fingertips. Ms. Baron noted an estimated ¾ of qualified applicants for Federal subsidized housing do not get it. This housing is extremely undersupplied.

Preston Korst noted HB4006 produced some data as to how many market rate units are being built vs subsidized... see DLCD summaries in the link:

[https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/up/pages/reporting.aspx#:~:text=House%20Bill%204006%20\(2018\)%20requires,1st%20of%20the%20following%20year.](https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/up/pages/reporting.aspx#:~:text=House%20Bill%204006%20(2018)%20requires,1st%20of%20the%20following%20year.)

- Colin Cooper asked how much new housing (of all kinds) and how quickly will it need to be built to make an impact in the ongoing increase in housing cost? Notwithstanding all the other variables. You need to include low interest rate (current ownership) vs high interest rate (new owners) in your list. Ms. Baron noted there is a need to build into the model projected future

needs. The national filtering estimates is 2-3% per year, which varies by tenure. Rentals filter faster than home units. Mr. Cooper noted the increasing population with demand for large homes and asked how we balance this with goals of reducing GHG emissions and transportation plans in subregional housing models. Mr. Reid noted the answers are being found at the local level. Chair Kloster noted the changes with state regulations and possible effects from these in housing supply projections. Ms. Baron noted the middle housing discussion will be part of the supply modeling with deeper analytics moving forward.

- Gerry Mildner noted Housing depreciation rates are estimated between 1.2% for single family and 1.4% for multi-family. Rates are lower if there is little construction. I've compared the total number of subsidized housing to the number of households below the poverty line, and it's about 50%. However, there's a lot of double-counting (e.g., LIHTC units receiving other subsidy programs), and LIHTC eligibility isn't the same as the poverty line. Madeleine's estimate of 25% of eligible households receiving benefits seems about right.
- Miranda Bateschell asked what are you hearing from developers on this topic? We have adopted variety standards but seeing pushback from developers, not wanting to develop Middle Housing, except for townhomes, which they are willing to build. There seems to be a lack of creativity, willingness to build these other needed types outside of single-family, multi-family, and townhomes.
- Rachel Loftin noted it's very hard to be creative in this market. Interest rates are high, suitable land is hard to get a hold of, and permitting timelines are long. Going through months of per-development costs for something that may not pencil as well and may not make it through land use is not a risk anyone wants to take in this environment.

Ms. Baron noted sometimes it comes down to the perceived risk. If there aren't many comps developers aren't confident that the new units will be absorbed (leased, bought) by the population. Sometimes, too, banks and lending institutions will not lend (at all or favorably) for new development types. And of course, Rachel's comments on the other headwinds across the market.

- Gerry Mildner asked does the ECONorthwest team (or Metro staff) know the amount of single-family housing in neighborhoods with private zoning (i.e., CC&Rs) that prevent middle housing from being built. Ms. Baron noted that wasn't something we identified specifically in this effort. I question whether the state legislation supersedes CC&Rs? This is definitely an area that is seeing more research and evaluation.
- Miranda Bateschell noted the legislation prohibited new CC&Rs from MH restrictions but did not negate those already in effect prior to the bill's adoption. Joseph Edge noted housing advocates knew that middle housing types would be generally slow to be adopted by developers (roughly 1% market absorption rate for infill/redevelopment). for nearer-term "middle housing" production, it looks likely that we need to ease townhouse standards & permitting. the share of other middle housing types should increase over a longer time period as developers grow more comfortable with investment potential of those typologies. Ms. Bateschell added It just makes it challenging to have policies to try and build to needs of the community. The choice is to mandate and potentially stall development. Or allow more flexible options and thus, the production of what the market wants to produce, which will continue to use what little land we have and not meet the needs of a vast segment of our populace. Seeing these problems continue or increase.

Justin Sherrill began the next section of the presentation with the Gentrification and Displacement Analysis. Two ways to look at Gentrification and Displacement were described.

Socioeconomic Vulnerability Six demographic groups who display heightened vulnerability via disproportionate rent burdening (in weighted order high to low)

1. Low-income renter households (<\$50,000)
2. Population without a bachelor's degree (age 25-64)
3. Households of color (non-White, non-Hispanic)
4. Households with disabilities (physical or cognitive)
5. Hispanic households
6. Population with low English proficiency (age 5+)

Gentrification & Displacement Typology The model characterizes each census tract's past gentrification trajectory, and, by extension, current displacement risk based on demographic and housing market changes between 2010 and 2021. Resulting typologies:

- Early-Stage Gentrification: contains vulnerable populations and is susceptible or experiencing either demographic or housing market changes
- Mid-Stage Gentrification: contains vulnerable populations and is experiencing both demographic and housing market changes
- Late-Stage Gentrification: contains vulnerable populations, experienced demographic changes, and housing market has appreciated

Comments from the committee:

- Gerry Mildner noted one of the limiting factors on the amount filtering is the outset of zoning and will it allow for cut ups. Many neighborhoods have private zoning and CCRs that prevent this from happening. How much housing in the region exist with these restrictions? Mr. Reid noted this task relies on title searches on thousands of thousands of properties. Ms. Baron added that while there is a statewide effort being done on this, it is laborious and a mostly manual project.
- Indi Namkoong thanked the presenters for explaining the N/A on maps that showed overlap between populations, demographics and economic factors, or lack of significant numbers being evaluated in the analysis. This data is important with the designations in working with strategies and solutions, not only for housing but planning infrastructure and transportations around our region.
- Gerry Mildner noted for the ECONorthwest team and the Metro staff, you might look for the locations of middle housing being built into and when you see neighborhoods where no middle housing is being built. That could be an indicator of where CC&Rs are effective in blocking middle housing from being developed. That is, look for voids. For policy makers, that might suggest strategies for overturning those kind of rules. That is, we will build sidewalks and install traffic bumps, if your neighborhood removes those kind of barriers to new housing investment.
- Miranda Bateschell noted CC&Rs are a problem and I agree talking about it regionally is worthwhile. We have issues not just with HOA CC&Rs but we have commercial CC&Rs in our Town Center. We created a vision for a walkable, vibrant, mixed-use Town Center, but it is challenging to achieve because the old Commercial CC&Rs don't allow multi-family residential as a use. It directly contradicts our new Town Center Plan and zoning provisions. This may be a challenge for other centers and CFAs.

ECONW did great work with us on both affordable and more attainable housing prices in Frog Pond (our new urban growth area). The only path is substantive dollars / investment by the City. I would echo sentiment on that last slide. If Metro could help land bank in Urban Reserves, it would help tremendously with us being able to get affordable housing in these areas.

Ms. Baron presented the remaining presentation on Potential Policy Responses to Prevent Gentrification and Involuntary Displacement in Redeveloping Areas. Gentrification and involuntary displacement can take many forms and are inherently hard to predict, measure, and track. No region or city has figured out how to stop gentrification and involuntary displacement. Policies and programs geared to prevent involuntary displacement are working in the context of powerful market dynamics and systems. A wide array of tools can and should be used to mitigate involuntary displacement.

Potential Metro policy responses to prevent / mitigate gentrification and involuntary displacement could include:

- A. Supporting Affordable Housing Development
- B. Preserving Existing Affordable and Low-Cost Housing Stock
- C. Supporting Lower-Income Renters and Homeowners
- D. Addressing Broader Community Impacts

Each of the policy responses were reviewed with possible funding and financial support, data, and policies. More information was noted in the packet than time allowed at this presentation.

Construction Career Pathways Overview and Update (Andre Bealer, Metro) Due to the lack of time to present, the agenda item was rescheduled to a later date.

Adjournment (Tom Kloster, TPAC Chair)

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by TPAC Chair Kloster at 11:45 a.m. Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, June 21, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	6/21/2023	6/21/2023 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	062123M-01
2	Work Program	6/14/2023	MTAC work program as of 6/14/2023	062123M-02
3	Work Program	6/14/2023	TPAC work program as of 6/14/2023	062123M-03
4	Draft Minutes	4/19/2023	Draft minutes from April 19, 2023 MTAC TPAC workshop	062123M-04
5	Memo	June 21, 2023	TO: MTAC, TPAC and interested parties From: Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 RTP update: Transit and tolling impacts on RTP performance and updated climate analysis	062123M-05
6	Memo	12/22/2022	TO: Ted Reid, Dennis Yee, Metro From: Mike Wilkerson, Becky Hewitt, Madeline Baron, James Kim, Jolie Brownell, ECONorthwest RE: METRO RESIDENTIAL READINESS PROJECT – TASK 4: HOUSING MARKET FILTERING MEMORANDUM - REVISED	062123M-06
7	Presentation	6/21/2023	Metro Residential Readiness Project Market Functions, Gentrification, and Displacement Trends	062123M-07
8	Handout	N/A	CONSTRUCTION CAREER PATHWAYS REGIONAL FRAMEWORK	062123M-08
9	Presentation	6/21/2023	2023 RTP system analysis update: transit, tolling and climate	062123M-09