



***RTO Subcommittee of TPAC
Wednesday, November 9, 2011
3 to 5 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Room 270***

Committee Members Present:

Dan Kaempff - Chair	Metro
Sarah Angell	TMA Representative
Dan Bower	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Adriana Britton	TriMet
Jennifer Campos	City of Vancouver
Gail Curtis (alternate)	Oregon Department of Transportation, Region 1
Sandra Doubleday	City of Gresham
Susan Drake	Department of Environmental Quality
Adrian Esteban	Community Representative
Derek Hofbauer	Community Representative
Steve Hoyt-McBeth	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Jen Massa Smith	City of Wilsonville SMART
Alison Wiley	Oregon Department of Transportation

Committee Members Excused:

Len Smith	Oregon Department of Energy
Aisha Willits	Washington County

Metro Staff:

Mary Ann Aschenbrenner	Metro
Pamela Blackhorse	Metro
Ted Leybold	Metro
Pam Peck	Metro
Deena Platman	Metro
Caleb Winter	Metro

Guests:

Lenny Anderson	Swan Island TMA
Brie Becker	Nelson Nygaard
Pete Collins	SWCR
Steve Hoyt-McBeth	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Ross Peterson	Nelson Nygaard
Jessica Roberts	Alta Planning

I. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF QUORUM/INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Kaempff declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Chair Kaempff provided a flyer for Metro's Active Transportation Program. He asked the Subcommittee to review the information and provide feedback for the program scope of work by next week.

II. MEETING SUMMARY FROM JULY & SEPTEMBER 2011 MEETINGS

Chair Kaempff asked if there were any changes to the July 13, and September 14, 2011 meeting minutes. Ms. Britton asked for changes to the July minutes for the redundant language for vehicle miles reduced. There were no changes to the September minutes.

Chair Kaempff asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes for July and September, with the changes as stated. Mr. Hofbauer moved to approve the meeting minutes. Ms. Britton seconded the motion. The meeting minutes for July 13, and September 14, 2011 were unanimously approved. There were no abstentions.

III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Roberts with Alta Planning briefly discussed the ACT Canada conference and asked the Subcommittee if they would be interested in more information.

Mr. Anderson of Swan Island TMA announced that there would be a ground breaking ceremony for the Waud Bluff Trail at 3 p.m. on November 15 and invited the Subcommittee members to attend.

IV. RTO STRATEGIC PLAN DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS & DISCUSSION

Chair Kaempff introduced Mr. Ross Peterson with Nelson Nygaard. Mr. Peterson presented the preliminary recommendations and a draft mission statement for the 2012-2017 RTO Strategic Plan. He outlined the goals and objectives based on findings from the think tank meeting, evaluation and stakeholder interviews, and staff and Subcommittee input. Additionally, he discussed the implications of the landscape scan and the biennial performance evaluation.

Further, Mr. Peterson talked about the approach to the new funding structure for the Plan. He discussed the new transportation demand management (TDM) landscape in light of current economic challenges and talked about reevaluating public/private partnership policy to determine what the desired outcomes should be.

Mr. Peterson presented four key issues: mission and desired outcomes, evaluation, actors and roles, and funding prioritizations. He stated that the mission and desired outcomes addressed quality of life, economic development, travel convenience, competitive travel choices, health and social and regional equity. He pointed out that climate change was down played due to economy and stated that vehicle miles reduced (VMR) should not be the only performance measure.

Further, he asked if RTO staff should play the role wholesaler or retailer. He recommended improvements be made by linking Metro's statement of "Making a Great Place" to the RTO mission and desired outcomes and suggested they identify how the program feeds into the performance targets of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) triple-bottom-line framework.

Mr. Peterson suggested the draft mission statement as: “Make the Portland Metro Region a great place by working with local and regional partners to promote travel options that increase active transportation, are environmentally sustainable, and support economically vibrant communities.”

The Subcommittee suggested that they move the last part of the statement to the beginning. Additionally, they questioned the value of leading with the value behind Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). Finally, they asked who the audience would be for the statement and asked if freight’s movement of goods and services should be included as an economic performance measure.

Mr. Peterson stated that the Subcommittee would be the audience for the mission statement. Chair Kaempff suggested that they view the mission statement in light of how the RTO Program would be presented to the public.

Mr. Peterson discussed the recommended goals and objectives for Plan:

Goal 1: “Align the RTO program with regional growth management and livability objectives.” This will help articulate performance measures for diverse projects and integrate RTO with other parts of Metro. Additionally, it should support projects that provide information and services to a geographically and socio-economically diverse population. Further it should work with other Metro programs and regional partners to make travel options part of every transportation project.

Goal 2: “Be a leader in developing local, regional, and national policies that promote walking, biking, transit and high-occupancy vehicle travel.” As such, RTO should develop programs that meet needs in urban centers, corridors, and suburban areas, as well as work with local jurisdictions to build local political and staff support. Additionally, the program should support local jurisdictions in developing and implementing policies that support the RTO mission, measure and evaluate the success of the Program to report progress, aid in decision-making and encourage innovation.

Goal 3: “Support local partners to engage with employers and commuters to increase the use of travel options for commute trips.” Mr. Peterson stated that employer outreach would remain a very important part of the program. It should support local partners to make and provide travel options services to employers and commuters, and provide information and technical services to local and regional partners. Additionally, it should make the business case for employers to support travel options, and address employer needs in transit underserved areas.

Goal 4: “Develop tools to support consideration of travel choices and the increased use of travel options for all trips.” Mr. Peterson pointed out that Drive Less, Save More (DLSM) was important to the program. He encouraged the Subcommittee and staff to continue the regional collaborative marketing coordination to increase awareness of travel options and reduce drive-alone trips, develop and enhance traveler information tools and provide technical services to local partners to help support the RTO mission.

The Subcommittee pointed out that they were already a leader in developing policy for walking and biking.

Mr. Peterson stated talked about evaluation and posed questions about what should be measured and how. Further, he stated that Nelson\Nygaard began a meta-evaluation or an evaluation of the evaluation process and provided successful evaluation examples.

Mr. Peterson addressed several evaluation challenges. He stated that some transportation management associations (TMAs) struggled to get private sector support and recommended not using VMR as the singular performance measure in the strategic plan. He suggested that small grant recipients struggled to achieve reporting requirements and pointed out that staff capacity was an issue, as well as the lack of consistency in reporting requirements.

Mr. Peterson stated that a singular VMR performance measure was not realistic, as not all programs are designed to achieve that VMR goal right away. Additionally, Mr. Peterson questioned how they might measure VMR performance to translate into health as a desired outcome. He asked if they should allow CMAQ reporting to drive performance measurements or was it possible to include other performance measures.

Moving forward, he stated that they would need to track other desired outcomes and multiple targets and recommended being more strategic about performance measures. Additionally he suggested that reporting and invoicing relate directly to contracted goals, RTO goals and the RTP. He stated that evaluations should align the level of reporting with the funding level and program type. Further, he suggested that program type point to awareness-focused or action-focused performance measures.

Mr. Peterson pointed out that some programs received more funds than others. He suggested that evaluation expectations grow with the amount of funding given. Further, he suggested they tie reporting and invoicing to the RTO goals and stated that programs that did not have as much funding utilize awareness-focused outputs only. He suggested that programs with outputs and preliminary outcomes consider some mechanism within the framework to estimate outcomes. Finally, Mr. Peterson proposed an evaluation framework of: RTP goals, RTO goals, RTO performance measures, contracted expectations, reporting requirements and evaluation. He stated that some of this already existed but would need to be strengthened.

The subcommittee again stated these suggestions were similar to what they do already. Additionally, they pointed out that funding for programs such as Sunday Parkways would be affected and felt that that this and other projects differed from measurement of individualized marketing (IM) programs. Mr. Peterson mentioned that Metro needs to understand this and be in sync with the amount that RTO invests.

Mr. Peterson discussed the roles for Metro, its partners and RTO. He stated that Metro should be a policy leader, a leader for program development and a regional liaison for shared best practices. Metro should build local capacity and political support, as well as provide technical services and regional marketing. However, partner roles should cover on-the-ground delivery, retail role, with Metro playing the wholesale role. Additionally, partners should continue with employer outreach and regional collaboration. Finally, he stated that TDM functions cover policy input, planning, travel options services such as ridematching, technical services, marketing and evaluation.

Further, Mr. Peterson pointed out that the role of Subcommittee was conflicted in terms of financial decision making versus being a collaborative forum. He stated that making financial decisions were divisive and did not support a collaborative forum. He suggested that the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) carry funding decisions and suggested that the RTO subcommittee hold quarterly forums.

The Subcommittee expressed concern. They pointed out that the details could get lost if funneled up to a higher level. However, they recognized the need to help TPAC fully understand how the Program and its more complex issues worked. Further, they stated that they looked at the overall picture and not just the numbers, which kept them from neglecting smaller groups who could benefit from funding and helped them structure where funds should go. Finally, they questioned whether separate roles would give them more freedom to collaborate and make recommendations based on the goals presented. They felt that developing a more straightforward evaluation may assist with strengthening the objective criteria.

Mr. Peterson responded that RTO and its partners had a culture that held onto programs that were not beneficial. He pointed out that committee objectivity tended to become diluted by the collaborative functions. Mr. Peterson asked them to consider the issue and whether or not it should be addressed.

Additionally, Mr. Peterson pointed out that, in terms of TMA policy, booster grants were a misnomer as it was similar to the base funding they already received. He pointed this out as a good example of why decision making was difficult and roles were incompatible.

Mr. Peterson presented the funding prioritization as a spectrum of opportunity in which formula funding and regional equity vied with performance of corridors and infrastructure. He pointed out that perspectives should address organizational capacity, consider outlying areas, corridors and local jurisdictions while providing formula funds for regional employer outreach done by TriMet. He stated that the current funding structure embodied many of stated issues and recommended a funding structure with a local performance-based approach. He recommended consolidating grants. He suggested combining TMA, IM and small grant program funding and emphasized the need for local support, a problem statement, a proven business model, or complementary funding stream. Additionally, he suggested shifting some administration funding to support Metro regional technical services.

Mr. Peterson stated that a competitive grant process would align with the previously mentioned goals, but acknowledged that political realities could influence these decisions. However, he stated that the benefits were already proven through local support and funding, emphasis on local transportation system plans (TSP)s and alignment with other regional infrastructure investments. Ideally, it would allow Metro staff to spend more time to build local capacity and provide technical services.

The Subcommittee pointed out that TMAs would have to go through a competitive process for funding. They questioned if there would be access to the technical services. They wondered what the implications would be for an established TMA. Finally, they stated that TMAs would not be guaranteed funding unless they meet the performance measures.

Mr. Peterson acknowledged their questions and stated that less money would stay with RTO staff, while more went out to partners. Grants would require local support. Performance measures would allow for small projects. He acknowledged that this would move funding from being TMA centric and shift focus from VMR goals to include performance measures.

The Subcommittee recognized that they needed a goal that would address economy and equity, but agreed that air quality alone would not be enough. RTO Staff pointed out that the RTP had six or more criteria that address economy, environment and community and asked what an economy based goal would look like. The Subcommittee suggested measuring productivity and value, but questioned how to

do this without using VMR. They asked if economic metrics would create a new set of issues and suggested that they address how much household income was spent, or not spent using alternative modes of transportation.

Mr. Peterson acknowledged the Subcommittee's suggestion for using mode shift as a performance measure. He proposed that they consider using mode split and VMR and their effects on health, active transportation and the reliability of transportation modes. Chair Kaempff pointed out that short trips would not generate VMR, but shifting modes for short trips is consistent with RTO goals. He suggested that they emphasize particular travel modes in geographic context.

The Subcommittee felt that congestion as a performance measure has challenges. Additionally, they stated level of service was a bad metric to use, but that a multiple measure process should be considered. Further, they pointed out that equity was rather broad. They asked that the strategic plan also consider people with disadvantaged backgrounds and how they influence mode shift. Mr. Peterson pointed out that they could also track the number of people contacted as an output.

The Subcommittee asked if Nelson Nygaard would be making more recommendations for the strategic plan. They suggested that partnerships be strengthened and asked for any suggestions for adding new partners in the future. Additionally, they suggested that health and wellness be tied in. Further, they asked if individualized marketing had policy language from past TPAC and JPACT funding decisions. Finally, they suggested that Nelson Nygaard consider an "opportunity statement" for grant applications (Nelson Nygaard's recommendation is to include a "problem statement").

Mr. Peterson stated that they would make additional recommendations for the plan based on the Subcommittee's input. The Subcommittee agreed that they had enough information to go on from Nelson Nygaard's presentation until a draft RTO Strategic Plan can be sent out December 7. Chair Kaempff asked the Subcommittee to get back to him with comments no later the next Subcommittee meeting on December 14.

V. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Kaempff adjourned the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

Meeting packet materials:

Document Type	Date	Description	Document Nbr.
Agenda	110911	Agenda, November 9, 2011	110911-rto01
Summary	110911	Meeting Summary, July 13, 2011	110911-rto02
Summary	110911	Meeting Summary, September 14, 2011	110911-rto03
Document	110911	Active Transportation Flyer	110911-rto04
Document	110911	Memorandum: CMAQ Quarterly Report	110911-rto05
Presentation	110911	Nelson Nygaard: RTO Strategic Plan	110911-rto06

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by,



Pamela Blackhorse
November 9, 2011