

Metro | Meeting Summary

RTO Subcommittee or TPAC

Wednesday, December 14, 2011

3 to 5 p.m.

Metro Regional Center, Room 501

Committee Members Present:

Dan Kaempff - Chair	Metro
Sarah Angell	TMA Representative
Dan Bower	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Adriana Britton	TriMet
Sandra Doubleday	City of Gresham
Susan Drake	Department of Environmental Quality
Adrian Esteban	Community Representative
Derek Hofbauer	Community Representative
Jen Massa	City of Wilsonville SMART
Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	Clackamas County
Heather McCarey	Westside Transportation Alliance
Alison Wiley	Oregon Department of Transportation
Aisha Willits	Washington County

Committee Members Excused:

Jennifer Campos	City of Vancouver
Len Smith	Oregon Department of Energy

Metro Staff:

Mary Ann Aschenbrenner	Metro
Pamela Blackhorse	Metro
Katie Edlin	Metro
Ted Leybold	Metro
Lake McTighe	Metro
Pam Peck	Metro
Deena Platman	Metro
Caleb Winter	Metro

Guests (signed in or verbally identified):

Lenny Anderson	Swan Island TMA
Brie Becker	Nelson Nygaard
Tom Brennan	Nelson Nygaard
Pete Collins	SWCR
Dave Eatwell	West Columbia Gorge Chamber of Commerce
Ross Peterson	Nelson Nygaard
Jessica Roberts	Alta Planning
Audrey Shuffield	VPSI
Pam Wilson	TriMet

I. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF QUORUM/INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Kaempff declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. MEETING SUMMARY FROM NOVEMBER 2011 MEETING

Chair Kaempff asked if there were any changes to the meeting Summary for November 9, 2011 (included with this record). There being none, Ms. Doubleday moved to approve the meeting summary. Mr. Hofbauer seconded the motion. The meeting summary for November 9, 2011 was approved unanimously. There were no abstentions.

III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There was none.

IV. RTO STRATEGIC PLAN DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS & DISCUSSION

Chair Kaempff introduced Mr. Brennan of Nelson Nygaard and reminded the Subcommittee that they were building on the draft mission statement and goals presented at the November meeting. He pointed out that the purpose of today's meeting was to gather input and feedback from the Subcommittee and identify the next steps needed before Plan adoption.

Chair Kaempff gave a brief overview of the RTO 2012 - 2015 Strategic Plan and the changes outlined by Nelson Nygaard. He stated that they would not be taking action on the draft plan today, but encouraged the Subcommittee to share their comments. He stated that the draft would be completed in January 2012 and sent to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) and the Metro Council by mid-year. Additionally, he cautioned that 2012 would be a transitional year in terms of funding and would be discussed further at future meetings.

Chair Kaempff encouraged the Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) attending to address the Subcommittee with comments directly. Additionally, he encouraged the Subcommittee to provide their input about the four key elements as they were presented; those being the mission goals and objectives, evaluation, roles and actors, and funding prioritization.

Mr. Brennan provided a handout (included with this record) and stated that they had captured the opportunities and recommendations as presented by partners and stakeholders. He pointed out two key questions that were raised during stakeholder interviews; namely, what outcomes should the RTO program strive to achieve and how the RTO program could closely align with other Metro programs and investments. He pointed out the opportunities that would link the RTO with other Metro programs by articulating goals that reflect and build on the goals already determined by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Additionally, he pointed out that using vehicle miles reduced (VMR) as a sole performance target resulted in missed opportunities that would normally be demonstrated as a regional contribution.

Further, Mr. Brennan pointed out that the RTO program was already well developed and would help RTO play a leadership role in performance-based planning. He recommended that they adopt a new mission statement and new performance targets that aligned with the triple-bottom-line. Mr. Brennan stressed the importance of infrastructure and roadway operations cost savings, as well as the integration of measures into existing evaluation methodology.

The Subcommittee suggested that the current draft mission statement was more program goal rather than a Subcommittee related and questioned if the purpose of the Subcommittee was to allocate

funding. They asked what the triple-bottom-line would be and asked for clarification on social benefits in terms of equity or social justice. Further, the TMAs stated that there was a failure within the Subcommittee structure to elevate transportation demand management (TDM) up the priorities of JPACT and TPAC.

Chair Kaempff responded that RTO and Subcommittee was a coordinated effort to develop a regional program they all agreed upon. The Subcommittee asked if they could review the mission statements of JPACT and TPAC and see if they were consistent with their program ideas. Ms. Peck pointed out that RTO currently had a mission statement and, as this was the third revision of the RTO Strategic Plan the mission statement should be consistent with the RTP. Finally, the Subcommittee stated that they were having difficulties deciding what priorities and projects should be funded and suggested that those priorities be better defined.

Mr. Brennan discussed the evaluation piece and reviewed the key questions surrounding performance tracking in relation to new goals and how the modified evaluation framework would fit the changing landscape. He pointed out that stakeholders felt that evaluation requirements were overly burdensome or disproportionate, and that the VMR target had a singular focus and return on investment, which skewed the performance measures. He stated that some programs may not yield results for several years, so quantitative results would not be ready within the one-year time frame.

Mr. Brennan suggested aligning these elements with the different grant funding levels and program type. He stated that RTO goals should be expressed through the evaluation criteria, recipient work plans, and invoice and reporting requirements based on a two-year evaluation. Further, he recommended that the process be internalized and that Metro consider funding longer term projects. Finally, he recommended utilizing an evaluation that focused on mode shift, education and outreach over a longer period of time.

The Subcommittee suggested providing grants that did not require VMR. Chair Kaempff stated that they could adjust the funding levels once the plan was adopted. The Subcommittee stated that they would still look at the expected outcomes, but that evaluation criteria should be directly tied to the triple-bottom-line approach. Additionally, they felt that the tiered approach was more realistic and suggested moving the ceiling of the bottom tier up. Finally, they stated that there should be a better distinction between the grantor's comments and actions.

Mr. Brennan called their attention to the roles and actors in the Plan, including partners, stakeholders and Metro staff. He stated that there was a need for functional changes and acknowledged that there was overlap to some of the functions currently implemented that conflicted with TMAs and TriMet. Additionally, he stated that employer outreach should be taken on by partners and that Metro should be a wholesaler. Mr. Brennan suggested that Metro release some of these functions to partners in order to put together a leaner program.

Mr. Brennan recommended that Metro focus on policy development, partner support and funding allocation. He suggested that partners and local jurisdictions direct and lead local outreach within the region, coupled with funding and technical support from Metro. Further, he suggested that they separate the Subcommittee roles into funding decision making, and committee policy advisory and collaborative functions.

The Subcommittee responded by using an example of map upgrades and technical support and questioned who would fund these types support. Mr. Brennan acknowledged that there may be a need for a competitive process for this and the allocation of internal staff time. Logistically, they may need to consolidate funds and provide a limited allocation for this. Chair Kaempff responded that they need to develop the logistics for that type of funding allocation and pointed out that implementing a two-year grant cycles would help. The Subcommittee stated that this type of partner support would need further clarification as the process moves forward.

Additionally, The Subcommittee questioned who would administer the Vanpool or Drive Less, Save More (DLSM) Programs. Mr. Brennan reminded them that Metro would shed its direct outreach function and that Oregon Department of Transportation had taken over DLSM already and pointed out that vanpools would most likely go to TriMet. Pam Wilson from TriMet said that they were considering the vanpool program. Mr. Brennan stated that TMA's would likely gain a higher level of employer outreach and that the new funding structure would also look at overlap between TriMet and the TMA's.

The Subcommittee expressed concern for areas that did not have access to TMAs or transit. They suggested that TriMet may need to deliver a full suite of programs and questioned how that would affect Metro and TriMet roles. Additionally, they pointed out that employers in rural areas expected a relationship with TriMet and that outreach would become increasingly important to help target and define locations with good potential.

Further, they suggested developing language for the Plan that reinforced first contact for handling outlying areas. They stated that TMAs were necessary for employer programs that did not have TMA contact and questioned what roles Metro and TriMet should have.

Chair Kaempff responded that the responsibility for funding distribution for employer outreach lay with TriMet and that Metro was the funding coordinator. He stated that TriMet and Metro were in a position of leadership and would need to be cautious. He pointed out TriMet would deliver programs and Metro would deliver policy.

The Subcommittee questioned whether TriMet should be running hands-on employer programs and if there would be enough funding for that level of service. Mr. Brennan responded that TMAs would handle this type of outreach if there were a TMA available for or within a specific area. He stated that if a TMA was not available, a local jurisdiction could go after funding to meet employer transit and transportation needs. The Subcommittee suggested that they would need to do a better job of coordinating how local jurisdictions, TriMet and TMAs would work together to meet employer needs.

Mr. Peterson questioned how best to define roles for each piece. He stated that they would need to be explicit about what roles TriMet would play and how best to avoid overlap. He suggested that Metro develop a Work Plan that defined these roles and allowed for a certain level of overlap.

The Subcommittee questioned whether TriMet should have a role in working with other forms of transportation. Further, they expressed concern about selling active transportation and questioned how TMAs would maintain their business through employers if TriMet took this element from them.

Ms. Britton replied that TriMet concentrated primarily on transit, but that they also discussed travel options that aligned with regional transit districts. Mr. Brennan recommended an expanded set of expectations in the draft Plan for this.

Mr. Leybold suggested a task force in which members of TPAC and stake holders would handle funding. The Subcommittee expressed some concern about developing a new committee, but Mr. Brennan pointed out that a task force would cover a broad geographic allocation. However, he stated that TPAC alone should make the final funding recommendations.

Mr. Brennan summarized the funding prioritization. He stated that 41% of total funds stayed within RTO, whereas 11% went to TMAs, 12% to small grants and 19% to individualized marketing (IM). He recommended that funding for TMAs, small grants and IM be combined into a single pot, which would allow for more funding for a single competitive grant program. TMAs could then apply for multiple individual grants for multiple programs, while formula funding for transit agencies remained in place for employer outreach.

The Subcommittee stated that the TMAs were concerned about the removal of performance based funding and felt that it would jeopardize existing TMAs. They stated that it would be difficult to get new programs off the ground without it. Mr. Brennan acknowledged their concern, but pointed out that TMAs were innovative when it came to funds. Additionally, he stated that the Plan would not open up the funding to every program, but would focus on primarily on TDM and employer outreach.

The Subcommittee felt that base funding would be helpful to TMAs in lieu of booster grants. They suggested a smaller base amount be set aside for TMAs only, which would be secure and separate from competitive funding. Further, they suggested competing for additional funding as needed.

Mr. Brennan stated that the TMA structure could survive primarily on business support, but acknowledged that that was not always available to TMAs. Additionally, he pointed out that if a TMA were not performing, then that TMA was not necessarily viable and should not depend solely on Metro for funding support. Mr. Brennan questioned what would happen when other groups came forward wanting to create a TMA and pointed out that the funding pot would not increase to meet that demand. He suggested that TMA funding expectations for Metro money needed to change.

Chair Kaempff stated that TMAs needed to demonstrate that they could be viable in order to receive funding. Further, he pointed out that this strategy would work if it stayed stable during the two-year funding cycle. He acknowledged that each TMA was different for each area and suggested that levels of funding should support those areas or programs that are viable or have the potential to be viable. Additionally, he recommended that they consider appropriate areas for TMAs where employer membership would be supported.

Chair Kaempff encouraged that Subcommittee to submit additional comments to him by the first week of January. He stated that they would revisit the Strategic Plan during the January 11, 2012 meeting, which is when they would need agreement for the Strategic Plan. The Plan would then go to TPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council by mid-year 2012.

V. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Kaempff adjourned the meeting at 5:13 p.m.

Meeting packet materials:

Document Type	Date	Description	Document Nbr.
Agenda	121411	Agenda, December 14, 2011	121411-rto01
Summary	121411	Meeting Summary, November 9, 2011	121411-rto02
Document	121411	Strategic Plan Mission, Goals & Objectives	121411-rto03

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by,



Pamela Blackhorse
December 14, 2011