

Metro | Agenda

Meeting: **RTO SUBCOMMITTEE OF TPAC**
Date: **Wednesday, September 8, 2010**
Time: **3:00 to 5:00 p.m.**
Place: **Room 501, Metro Regional Center, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland**

To join the meeting by phone, please contact Pamela Blackhorse in advance of the meeting at Pamela.Blackhorse@oregonmetro.gov or 503-797-1757. Pamela will call you from the meeting room to link you to the phone conference. Conference calls are limited to three people.

- 3:00 p.m. Call to order/declaration of a quorum/introductions
- 3:05 p.m. Meeting summary from July 2010 Meeting
[Approval Requested]* – Dan Kaempff, Metro
- 3:05 p.m. Citizen Communications
- 3:10 p.m. RTO Travel and Awareness Survey Review
[Informational]* – Caleb Winter & Derek Hofbauer, Metro
- 3:45 p.m. 2012 RTO Work Plan Discussion
[Informational]* – Dan Kaempff & Deena Platman, Metro
- 4:15 p.m. ODOT Flexible Funds Project Application
[Informational]* – Dan Kaempff, Metro
- 4:45 p.m. Program updates – all (time permitting)
- 5:00 p.m. Adjourn

* Meeting materials will be available electronically prior to the meeting.



RTO Subcommittee of TPAC
Wednesday, July 14, 2010
3:00 to 5:00 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Room 501

Committee Members Present:

Dan Kaempff - Chair	Metro
Dan Bower	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Adriana Britton	TriMet
Susan Drake	Department of Environmental Quality
Adrian Esteban	Community Representative
Karen Frost	Westside Transportation Alliance
Derek Hofbauer	Community Representative
Jen Massa	City of Wilsonville SMART
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	Clackamas County
Alison Wiley	Oregon Department of Transportation
Aisha Willits	Washington County
Carla Wood	Oregon Department of Energy

Committee Members Excused:

Ken Burgstahler	WSDOT
Jennifer Campos	City of Vancouver
Sandra Doubleday	City of Gresham
Keith North	Community Representative
Teak Wall	Community Representative

Metro Staff:

Roberta Altstadt	Metro
Mary Ann Aschenbrenner	Metro
Pamela Blackhorse	Metro
Katie Edlin	Metro
Deena Platman	Metro
Caleb Winter	Metro

Guests:

Bibiana McHugh	TriMet
Jessica Roberts	Alta Planning
Mark Sullivan	City of Hillsboro

I. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Kaempff called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. He declared a quorum and asked the Subcommittee for introductions.

II. MEETING SUMMARY FROM MAY 2010 MEETING

Chair Kaempff asked if there were any changes to be made to the May 12, 2010 meeting summary. Ms. Frost motioned to approve the meeting summary. Ms. Massa seconded the motions. The Subcommittee approved the May 12, 2010 meeting, with Ms. Willits abstaining as she was not present during the May 2010 meeting.

III. COMMUNITY MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

IV. TRIMET OPEN SOURCE MULTI-MODAL TRIP PLANNER PROJECT UPDATE

Chair Kaempff introduced Ms. McHugh of TriMet. Ms. McHugh provided a presentation on their Open Trip Planner project and discussed the use of open source, non-proprietary software and other open data sources. She pointed out that open source data programs were a good resource for developers and stated that there were common applications that could provide tracking and transit information for the iPhone and allows for broad use by most operating systems and programming languages. Additionally, regional countries, states and cities are contributing data sets which help support program and data evolution. Currently the program is only available in beta format while developers are work on creating support for Open Trip Planner.

Ms. McHugh pointed out that they were working to integrate all trip planners, but that the current software made it easy to jump from one trip planner application to another. Additionally, the application allows users to select their own data and geo-coding service, uses open free data from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) open data sets and from Google Transit. Finally, Ms. McHugh stated the Open Trip Planner would replace TriMet's current trip planner and could be an alternative for 511 and other trip planning sites.

The Subcommittee asked how well the program worked with other trip planners, questioned if it would go statewide and if there were funding from sources other than RTO. They asked when the application would be ready for consumer use and if there was access beta testing. Further, they pointed out that although the system was detailed oriented, developers may wish to consider leaving room for generalization. This would help in locating landmarks or incomplete address locations. Finally, they asked if it had the ability to do text searches and options for combining transit modes.

Ms. McHugh responded that TriMet would be meeting with ODOT next week to plan for Google Transit and that they planned to work with Wilsonville SMART on the application. She advised that, while they plan to release the program next year the system required an additional four months for internal testing and data improvements. Further, she stated that data testing was open to the public and that they would accept additional volunteers for system testing. She advised the Subcommittee to go to OpenTripPlanner.org and access the live demo link for more information. Additionally, she pointed out that they had a marketing site to help raise funding to support the program and would add text searches in the next planning phase. Finally, she stated that searching for safe, multi-mode trips were possible using the current application.

V. 2011-2013 RTO GRANTS CRITERIA

Chair Kaempff provided information on RTO grant criteria for 2011-2013 and briefly discussed the most recent RTO Subcommittee changes, including a proposed increase in the minimum grant amount to \$25,000 with maximum grant amount placed at \$200,000. Parking management was also added as a new criteria and focuses on creating interest in parking management projects. Smaller changes were the addition of an optional pre-application step and the discontinuation of funding for printing local walking and cycling maps.

The Subcommittee asked if RTO would fund maps other than local bike and walk maps, or if maps could be made accessible for online for printing. Additionally, they questioned if the preferred goals and program grants should be ranked. Chair Kaempff reminded the Subcommittee that maps were not sustainable or economical when repeatedly printed and given away for free. Chair Kaempff stated that Metro was considering providing data at a more robust level regionally using open source protocols. He pointed out that developers could then create tools, such as printed maps or online services that would keep up with real-time data sets and changes.

Further, when questioned about the Bike There! map, Chair Kaempff stated that the map generated revenue and helped maintain current online map data and was therefore sustainable. He pointed out that working with tandem with regional partners to create a regional bike map would also be sustainable and cost effective way to make the bike map.

The Subcommittee questioned whether projects outside of downtown areas would be considered and if additional funding could be separated out for a different grant cycle. Chair Kaempff stated that projects outside city limits would be considered and scored, but that projects in 2040 Centers would potentially score higher. Additionally, he stated that the current pot of grant money would not be split for a different grant cycle and cautioned that the current funds would not be used for individualized marketing (IM) either.

The Subcommittee also questioned if elevation of the base amount of grant funds was ethical given the current economical situation. They pointed out that agency partners were attempting to be financially sustainable and suggested leaving the base amount at \$15,000 to \$25,000. Chair Kaempff stated that projects under consideration were not guaranteed grant funds. However, if they keep the entry level for grants low the additional funding would fall back on RTO, making the grant process more time consuming and complicated.

Further, the Subcommittee asked whether the Carefree Commuter Challenge had been included as part of the program. Chair Kaempff stated that he would review that information and get back to the Subcommittee with a response.

Additionally, they discussed the parking criteria for projects that provide parking management implementation and strategies. The Subcommittee suggested leaving out specific areas that would cover parking cash-out and suggested that points should not be awarded for simply funding a parking study. They suggested implementing parking policies that set boundaries and change behavior, taking into account parking minimums and maximums, parking for bikes and carpools and overall pricing based on parking areas or structures per project.

Finally, the Subcommittee briefly discussed the use of low or no emission modes of travel. They suggested that three modes may not be productive, but that one mode would. Chair Kaempff pointed out that they should reward all modes of low or no emission travel, stating that in the past they used one mode and ended up eliminating bike use. As such, Mr. Winter suggested that they keep criteria focused on the number of options currently available.

The Subcommittee suggested that criteria touch on both carbon reduction and activity level. Chair Kaempff suggested breaking it up into two different criteria and moving vehicle miles reduced (VMR) to a bonus section. However, he cautioned the Subcommittee that reduction in VMT would be difficult as applicants would have to be able to prove the reduction. Additionally, he questioned the level of financial support over and above the criteria to measure levels of carbon reduction and suggested that the language should remain as is for the criteria. Upon further discussion, the Subcommittee decided not to make this a part of the grant criteria.

Chair Kaempff suggested that staff go back and rework the criteria for the parking management implementation and recommended strategies section and address the behavior aspect of parking management and how best to award points for these types of projects. Point could be awarded for replacing or reducing parking, charging for parking or imposing parking restrictions. Finally, Chair Kaempff suggested that criteria four, which covers the use of no or low emission modes should remain as is. However, staff will make the necessary changes to the second criteria for parking management and ask for a vote from the Subcommittee on the final grant criteria the following week.

Chair Kaempff also asked for member of the Subcommittee to be part of the RTO grant selection committee if they were not already planning to apply for a grant. Ms. Wiley, Mr. Esteban, Mr. Hofbauer. Ms. Wood and Ms. Drake agreed to be on the selection committee. Chair Kaempff also suggested one other non-RTO related Metro staff person, as well as one from the county health partnership is included on the committee as well.

VI. CITY OF PORTLAND, SMARTTRIPS UPDATE.

Mr. Bower advised that SmartTrips summer events held on Columbia Boulevard and 20th would be affected by Portland street car construction. He stated that Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) would like to use their RTO grant funds from July 10, 2010 to July 11, 2011 to hold 2010-2011 SmartTrips events in the Cully and Chautauqua neighborhoods instead. Mr. Bower pointed out that they would be able to make good connections within these communities and is requesting that the grant funds be transferred to SmartTrips events for these areas.

Action taken: Chair Kaempff asked if there were a motion to approve the request to transfer RTO grant funds to SmartTrips events. Mr. Hofbauer motioned to approve the change. Ms. Britton seconded the motion. The Subcommittee unanimously approved the change. There were no abstentions.

VII. UPDATE FROM JPACT DISCUSSION ON REGIONAL FLEXIBLE FUND ALLOCATION

Chair Kaempff provided a brief overview of the Regional Flexible Fund allocation and stated that the Councils next steps are to appoint a joint task force between freight and active transportation groups. He advised that this would help develop project lists that would address both freight and active transportation needs and work with local and county committees on infrastructure projects, as well as help build parts of the intertwine.

VII. PROGRAM UPDATES

Chair Kaempff asked if the subcommittee to advise if they would be available for the September Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Winter asked for volunteers to help with the Region One survey and develop a scope of work and a questionnaire that would be brought to the September Subcommittee meeting.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Kaempff adjourned the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

Meeting packet materials:

Document Type	Date	Description	Document Nbr.
Agenda	071410	Agenda for July 14, 2010	071410-rto01
Summary	071410	Meeting minutes, May 12, 2010	071410-rto02
Document	071410	Draft 2011-13 Travel Options grant application packet	071410-rto03
Memo	071410	TPAC: Regional flexible Fund Allocation policy summary	071410-rto04
Document	071410	Revised JPACT June 10, 2010 meeting minutes	071410-rto05
Memo	071410	2011-2013 grant program criteria	071410-rto06
Document	071410	Portland SmartTrips grant transfer letter	071410-rto07

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by,

Date

RTO Program Levels for Travel and Awareness Survey (refer to page 7 on survey questionnaire)

1. TriMet Trip Planner

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about the trip planner? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by going online and planning a trip? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? _____

(If respondent didn't use the service, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of using the trip planner? Did you

1. Make fewer single person car trips?
2. Plan your trip better?
3. Ride transit more frequently?
4. Other *(open)* _____

Level 5) Overall, how satisfied were you with using the trip planner?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

2. Carpool Match NW

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about Carpool Match NW? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by signing up for the service? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? _____

(If respondent didn't participate in the program, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of using Carpool Match NW? Did you...

1. Make fewer single person car trips?
2. Increase your level of carpooling?
3. Convince others to carpool?
4. Other *(open)* _____

Level 5) Overall, how satisfied were you with using the service?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

3. City of Portland Smart Trips

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about the Smart Trips program? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by ordering transportation materials? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? _____

(If respondent didn't participate in the program, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of the Smart Trips program? Did you...

1. Make fewer single person car trips?
2. Bicycle more?
3. Walk more?
4. Ride transit more?
5. Carpool more?

6. Other (open) _____

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the program?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

4. BTA bike Commute Challenge

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about the bike commute challenge? (open)

Level 3) Did you participate by competing in the challenge? Y or N

If No: then how did you participate? _____

(If respondent didn't participate in the challenge, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of the bike commute challenge? Did you...

1. Make fewer single person car trips?
2. Increase your physical activity?
3. Bicycle more to work?
4. Bicycle more for other trips such as shopping or leisure?
5. Other (open) _____

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the event?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

5. Bike There! Map

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about the Bike There! Map? (open)

Level 3) Did you purchase and use the map? Y or N

If No: then how did you participate?

(If respondent didn't use the map, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of using the map? Did you...

1. Plan your trips better?
2. Make fewer single person car trips?
3. Bicycle more?
4. Walk more?
5. Ride transit more?
6. Other (open) _____

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the map?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

6. Bycycle.org

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about bycycle.org? (open)

Level 3) Did you plan a trip or use a map? Y or N

If No: then how did you participate? *(open)*

(If respondent didn't use the service, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of using bicycle.org? Did you...

1. Plan your trips better
2. Make fewer single person car trips
3. Bicycle more
4. Other (open)

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the website?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

7. Walk There! Guidebook

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about the Walk There! Guidebook? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by purchasing and using the guidebook? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? *(open)*

(If respondent didn't use the guidebook, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of using the Walk There! Guidebook? Did you...

1. Plan your trips better
2. Make fewer single person car trips
3. Walk more
4. Other (open)

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the guidebook?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

8. Wilsonville Walk SMART

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about Wilsonville Walk SMART? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by receiving a pedometer and recording your daily steps? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? *(open)*

(If respondent didn't participate in the program, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of using the Walk SMART program? Did you...

1. Make fewer single person car trips
2. walk more
3. Other (open)

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the program?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

9. WTA Carefree Commuter Challenge

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about the WTA Carefree Commuter Challenge? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by joining the challenge? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? *(open)*

(If respondent didn't participate in the program, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of competing in the Challenge? Did you...

1. Make fewer single person car trips
2. Walk more
3. Bike more
4. Ride transit more
5. Other *(open)*

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the challenge?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

10. Metro Vanpool

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about Metro's vanpool program? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by joining a vanpool? Y or N

If No, then how did you participate? *(open)*

(If respondent didn't participate in the program, then level 4 and 5 questions are not asked)

Level 4) What actions did you take as a result of joining a vanpool? Did you

1. Make fewer single person car trips
2. Carpool/vanpool more
3. Ride transit more
4. Other *(open)*

Level 5) How satisfied were you with the vanpool?

1. Very satisfied
2. Somewhat satisfied
3. Somewhat dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied

11. Drive Less/Save More

Level 2) Where did you most recently see or hear about Drive Less/Save More? *(open)*

Level 3) Did you participate by.....

1. Going to the website? Y or N
2. Filling out a pledge card? Y or N
3. Signing up to receive emails? Y or N

Level 4) What actions did you take after learning about Drive Less/Save More. Did you....

4. Reduce the amount you drive? Y or N
5. Combine your car trips to run errands? Y or N
6. Walk, bike, or use transit instead of taking the car? Y or N
7. Avoid taking car trips by working or shopping from home? Y or N
8. Start or increase carpooling with others? Y or N



Date: September 8, 2010
To: RTO Subcommittee
From: Dan Kaempff
Re: **ODOT Flexible Funding Grant Opportunity**

The purpose of this memo is to inform the Subcommittee of funding availability from ODOT and to solicit input regarding regional project ideas.

Background

House Bill 2001, also known as the Oregon Jobs and Transportation Act, is the transportation funding plan adopted by the 2009 Legislature. Three core themes emerged from the legislation:

- accountability, innovation and environmental stewardship;
- highway, road and street funding; and
- multimodal funding.

The third bullet point resulted “in the Oregon Transportation Commission [adopting] a rule that sets aside \$24 million per year in flexible federal money that had been used in the state highway program. This money will fund eligible non-road projects such as public transportation capital purchases and construction, transportation demand management (for example, rideshare and carpool programs), and transportation growth management and similar planning activities. These projects will be selected through the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program process.”ⁱ

ODOT convened a committee to determine criteria for allocating these funds. On August 11, the Commission approved the committee-drafted criteria. More information is available to download at ODOT’s website.ⁱⁱ The Purpose and Vision statements describe, at a high level, the Commission’s intent for how these funds are to be used.

Purpose statement

- Support sustainable non-highway transportation projects, programs and services that positively impact modal connectivity, the environment, mobility and access, livability, energy use and the overall operation of the transportation system.

Vision statement

- Create livable and sustainable communities where multimodal transportation facilities, services and programs provide safe, comfortable and convenient options that support active living.
- Provide equitable options for accessing housing, jobs, services and educational opportunities.
- Outcomes: investments that help Oregonians access transportation choices and enhance energy independence and sustainability.

Other facts related to the criteria

- Targeted at non-highway purposes; transit, TDM, bike/ped projects only
- Funds available in the 2009-2011 budget cycle
- \$1 million cap on individual projects
- Only government agencies eligible to apply
- Applications due in December

In addition, ODOT Public Transit Division is requesting funding for a state vanpool program and to restore funding for the DSLM effort in Portland region.

Potential Metro projects

Metro sees the opportunity for funding several potential regional projects. Ideas could include:

- Expanded Individualized Marketing efforts:
 - targeting new/relocated residents,
 - employer-based IM projects.
- Expand “Sunday Parkways” - type events to suburban communities.
- Bicycle parking funding - could be a bucket of grant funds that local jurisdictions could access (Metro purchases racks, partners responsible for sighting and installation.)
- Develop traveler information/data maintenance project.
- Grow RTO Grant program (somewhat unlikely – not a specific project – but worth asking?)

RTO partners are encouraged to submit additional ideas for regional projects as well as applying for funding for local projects that further the goals and objectives of the RTO Strategic Plan.

ⁱ www.oregon.gov/ODOT/JTA/overview.shtml

ⁱⁱ www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/otc_main.shtml. In the 2010 column, click “background materials” in the August box.