



***RTO Subcommittee or TPAC  
Wednesday, January 11, 2012  
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
Gail Curtis (alternate)	Oregon Department of Transportation
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 (alternate)	TMA Representative
Alison Wiley	Oregon Department of Transportation
Aisha Willits	Washington County

**Committee Members Excused:**

Jennifer Campos	City of Vancouver
-----------------	-------------------

**Metro Staff:**

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

**Guests:**

Leslee Moore	Enterprise Rideshare
Cora Potter	Ride Connection
Tom Shahaden	Enterprise Rideshare
Audrey Shuffield	VPSI
Beth Wheeler	Enterprise Rideshare
Brad Windler	C-Tran
Pam Wilson	TriMet

## I. CALL TO ORDER/DECLARATION OF QUORUM/INTRODUCTIONS

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

## II. MEETING SUMMARY FROM DECEMBER 2011 MEETING

Chair Kaempff and the Subcommittee asked for corrections to the meeting summary from December 14, 2011. Chair Kaempff asked if there were a motion to approve the meeting summary with the recommended changes.

*Action taken:* Ms. Willits motioned to approve the December meeting summary. Ms. Wiley seconded the motion. The Meeting summary for December 14, 2011 was unanimously approved with changes. There were no abstentions.

## III. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS

There were none.

## IV. RTO STRATEGIC PLAN DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS & DISCUSSION

Chair Kaempff announced that the purpose of the primary discussion item was to resolve any outstanding issues surrounding the draft 2013-2018 RTO Strategic Plan. He stated that there would be an additional meeting held on February 8, 2012 if recommendations were not supported and issues were not resolved. Additionally, he pointed out that once the Subcommittee agreed upon the recommendations, a revised draft Strategic Plan would be presented to the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (TPAC) for adoption, after which a 30-day public comment period would begin before the draft went to Council.

Chair Kaempff provided a matrix with a summary of issues raised via the Subcommittee's comments and recommendations to date. He asked if there was any additional information needed for the matrix. There were none.

Chair Kaempff noted that the common issue was that revenue was declining. He reminded them that they were in the process of determining how to take a good program and make it better without any additional revenue. He requested that they focus on what the common issues were for the Program, instead of on individual partner needs.

Further, he pointed out that the Plan would not include any detailed tactical elements for the program and that additional planning, once the Plan was adopted would be required to implement these tasks, which include:

- Grant criteria for a consolidated grant program,
- Establishment of a process for grant decision making through TPAC,
- Development of performance and evaluation parameters for the Program; and
- Definition and refinement of roles and responsibilities for Partners.

Chair Kaempff pointed out that the draft Plan recommended that Metro no longer conduct public outreach duties and perform roles which support partners who are responsible for direct public outreach.

The Subcommittee questioned who would handle the Drive Less Connect (DLC), rideshare and vanpool programs in place of TriMet, who has indicated they cannot take on these duties. Chair Kaempff pointed out that funds for the program would be transferred to the agency for staffing for administration of DLC. He asked the Subcommittee to consider if regional dollars were best spent for vanpooling, given the transportation needs for different areas. The Subcommittee responded that some locations were not

supported by transit or bike, so vanpool or carpool were ideal for more suburban areas. Additionally, they stated that vanpools were ideal for people with more than 10 miles to travel. Further, Ms. Wiley pointed out that rideshare was potentially more important than vanpool in that it covered multi-modal transportation, which included vanpool.

Chair Kaempff questioned whether vanpool should be supported through RTO when funds were scarce. Additionally, he asked the Subcommittee if they would like more information on vanpool and whether they would like to hold a more detailed conversation around this issue at another meeting. The Subcommittee agreed to postpone the vanpool discussion for the time being.

Ms. Wiley stated that DLC was fundamental for providing travel options, but pointed out that ODOT was a wholesaler for DLC in that they only provide access to partners around the state to the DLC site. The Subcommittee questioned who would operate it and support it, and what level. Chair Kaempff pointed out that in the current consultant's recommended strategic plan, Metro was not envisioned as being the DLC administrator.

The Subcommittee stated that they would like to see Metro continue to support DLC, since Metro has played this role in the past. Additionally, they asked if there were any funds available from the state for DLC. Mr. Bower noted that the Strategic Plan had recommended additional funding for TriMet, based on the assumption that TriMet would take that role on. Since they were not, he questioned if that money would go back to Metro to run DLC.

Ms. Peck interjected that for several years Metro had spend \$30,000 a year to support CarpoolMatchNW and had made a considerable investment to get it off the ground. She suggested that the Subcommittee review the state Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, which lays out funding for the future. Additionally, she stated that planning efforts need to look at efficiencies, since costs have increased where budgets have not. She suggested that there may be a need for one localized call center for DLC and questioned what the state's role was for rideshare. Finally, she questioned if there were room in the Strategic Plan for Metro to provide staff time to support the state's role.

Chair Kaempff stated that Metro would keep the site functional at a regional level and continue provide user support if that was the desire of regional partners. However, marketing and outreach for the site was the responsibility of partners and TMAs. He asked the Subcommittee if Metro should continue administering rideshare and DLC. If so, he would get back to them with new budget figures. The Subcommittee responded that they did feel that Metro should continue to provide administrative support for rideshare and DLC.

*Action taken:* Mr. Bower recommended that DLC administrative support move back to the State of Oregon over the course of the five-year RTO Strategic Plan. Adrian Esteban seconded the motion. The motion passed, with Ms. Wiley abstaining.

Chair Kaempff discussed TriMet and Wilsonville SMART's roles as retailers for regional and partner needs. He stated that, historically Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds were used to support partners in this role and stated that there was a need for employer programs that supported partners as well. Chair Kaempff asked for a response from TriMet.

Ms. Britton stated that TriMet supports traditional and non-traditional travel options, such as a short work week. She recognized that there was a lot of overlap with TMAs in this capacity. Chair Kaempff asked if TriMet had the ability to pick up the slack for handling multi-modal conversations with

employers and pointed out that this was a key question that needed to be resolved, since Metro would no longer be conducting employer outreach, particularly regarding ridesharing. Ms. Willits added that they would also need to define how and where TMAs handled employers in their respective areas.

Mr. Winter pointed out that the consultants had recommended a regional coordinator for this aspect of the Plan to help address the issue of overlap. The Subcommittee asked if TMAs received help from TriMet for employer outreach. Additionally, they asked TriMet to clarify the number of staff used for employer outreach and if that number would remain the same without an increase in budget.

Ms. Britton stated that TriMet had 5.25 full time employees (FTE) dedicated to employer outreach functions. She pointed out that this number would not increase or decrease with their current funding parameters, but they would continue to work with TMAs to provide regional services to employers. Additionally, she pointed out that TriMet could not cover all employers. However, if an employer were located within a TMA area, they referred employers to the TMAs responsible for that area. Ms. Angell added some clarification to Ms. Britton's comment, stating that TMAs worked with both TriMet and employers.

Chair Kaempff stressed the need to be strategic in how they delivered services and managed expectations about the levels of service provided and who the best partner, or partners were to provide that service. He stated that TriMet and Wilsonville SMART would continue to provide a base level of outreach regionally and take on an additional marketing role to support Rideshare, where Metro has assisted.

Additionally, he asked if redefining the roles for TriMet and SMART was acceptable, in terms of taking on more rideshare and vanpool marketing tasks. The Subcommittee stated that it was. Ms. Wiley asked whether accountability would be built into that. Chair Kaempff responded that performance measures needed to be defined and asked how best to define them. Metro would continue to provide evaluation for the RTO program under the new strategic plan. Ms. Wiley used the example that TriMet could use DLC registration as part of their measurement.

The Subcommittee agreed that they were in agreement with these roles for TriMet and SMART.

Chair Kaempff discussed the roles and responsibilities for the partnership between TMAs and TriMet and what that would look like. He stated that TMAs would prefer to be the first point of contact. Ms. Britton commented that, if businesses contact TriMet directly, TriMet has an obligation to respond. But they currently do and would continue to refer them to a TMA in their area of the business. Additionally, she stated that TriMet provides assistance with ECO surveys to employers and that these activities are supported with money from the TriMet general fund, not their RTO funds.

Ms. Angell stated that TMAs worked differently throughout the region, but that all TMAs provided employer outreach by using a tag team approach with TriMet. Mr. Bower pointed out that these relationships are not a role defined in the Strategic Plan and asked how best to address these relationships. Chair Kaempff acknowledged that they did need to address TriMet and partner coordination with regards to program delivery, but flagged this question for later discussion since it was more funding related.

Chair Kaempff reviewed the recommended grant program. He reminded the Subcommittee that the consultants recommended one grant program to provide more flexibility in RTO on how they give out funds. He stated that this would reduce the burden of grant administration and project costs.

Additionally, it would allow them to streamline measurements for the triple-bottom-line goals set in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and to scale measurements based on project costs. Funding for grants overall would increase due to Metro staff reductions and other efficiencies to be gained by only administering one grant pot. Chair Kaempff recognized that TMAs felt they needed funding from Metro to sustain their program and asked TMAs for their input. But funding policy should be focused on achieving outcomes, not support of certain organizations, such as TMAs.

Ms. McCarey commented TMAs did indeed need continual support for their budgets. She pointed out that it was difficult to forecast future needs when they did not know what their budget would look like for the following year. It would be difficult to meet the region's needs if TMAs were to cease to exist.

Ms. Mastrantonio replied that while she wished to show support for TMA's work, jurisdictions also needed grant funding opportunities. She questioned that if TMAs were to receive a dedicated portion of the funds, why wouldn't jurisdictions as well? She asked rhetorically if this was an equitable way to distribute funding.

Ms. Angell opined that TMAs are strategically located (in centers) and they should be recognized for the public-private partnership they deliver to the region to support TDM programs.

The Subcommittee pointed out that if a TMA works, RTO usually commits to funding. They questioned what would happen when a TMA failed to deliver on the public-private partnership agreement. It should not fall to Metro to continue funding them if they were not performing.

Additionally, they questioned how this dynamic would work for new TMAs. Chair Kaempff pointed out that in the past that new TMAs could get start up funding. However, expectations for local funds have not fully been. The consultant findings were that TMAs, as a group, did not live up to the promise and expectations of local partners.

He stated that TMAs are a good asset to the region, but that, collectively, they did not warrant a unique funding model, since each TMA worked differently. He acknowledged that, although some TMAs might feel that this was an unrealistic expectation, it was not unrealistic for the businesses that utilized and benefited from a TMA to support them financially.

Ms. Massa asked if they should consider a longer grant cycle for TMAs. Chair Kaempff stated that they would need to create a rationale for why they would do that. Individual TMAs vary in their levels of results and successes. He asked them to consider how they would justify dedicating and spending funds already under public scrutiny for TMAs. Additionally, he pointed out that they did not have a recommendation to support TMAs with dedicated funding and stated that if staff needed to change that, they would need to know why. Failing that, the decision would need to go to TPAC for resolution.

Ms. Wiley stated that they were not questioning the valuable work TMAs performed. However, she asked them to consider the idea that TMAs could indeed flourish under this new model. She pointed out that they should not resist change just because it is change.

Ms. McCarey stated that the Plan did not support TMAs in writing as an important partner, but that it indicates support for transit. Ms. Wiley replied that guarantees for funding simply don't exist, that they were performance-based.

Ms. Willits asked if they could transition into funding. Chair Kaempff stated that Fiscal Year 2013 would be a transitional year, with the current TMA funding remaining in place for one final year. Metro would initiate the new recommended grant process in FY 2014.

Mr. Bower pointed out that the roles in the Plan were not identified for each partner, which made it difficult for partners to commit. He stated that they would need to make commitment to many partners. Otherwise the process should remain competitive. Additionally, he stated that they needed to hold the Subcommittee and partners accountable and pointed out that formula funding in terms of performance was not supported. Finally, he questioned what the performance measures were and if they should be asking a different set of questions.

Chair Kaempff said that the consultants had heard from partners and local jurisdictions that they wanted more opportunity to pursue project funding. He pointed out that the new recommended strategic plan sought to give partners more flexibility and visibility without the use of a one-size-fits-all program. He cautioned the Subcommittee that wished to continue dedicated funding, that funding would be held to a higher level of evaluation.

Mr. Hofbauer asked if they could provide grant criteria to the TMAs. Chair Kaempff stated that the Subcommittee would not be responsible for writing the grant criteria. Further, grant criteria did not rise to the level of inclusion in the strategic plan. He asked instead for the Subcommittee to submit comments on the draft principles in the Plan, looking in particular for input as to whether or not the principles reflected the value provided by the TMAs.

Mr. Bower replied that a TMA receiving or not receiving a grant in a given cycle could mean that the TMA would not have sufficient funding to continue operation. He pointed out that historically, the Subcommittee had not been willing to make difficult funding choices regarding TMA performance, and that it was important to better identify the role of the new TPAC work group that would be responsible for RTO funds in the future. This conversation was tabled to the February 8 Subcommittee meeting.

Ms. McCarey asked for clarification on if entire amount of RTO funding would be entirely distributed on a project basis. Chair Kaempff stated that it was the amount of the funds determined for grants that would be project-based. The Subcommittee suggested that they change the Plan terminology to “project or service” to draw a distinction between the base Employer Outreach program and projects funded through the grant program. The Subcommittee also agreed that a “project” could potentially be a continuation of an ongoing program for the purposes of a grant application. The Subcommittee agreed that the strategic plan should contain “principles of the grant program” instead of the actual grant criteria itself.

Chair Kaempff asked the Subcommittee, prior to the next meeting, to submit comments and recommendations on the existing goals and objectives in the plan, reminding them that their role was to provide recommendations on the strategic plan can continue to support good projects, not to support organizations. He stated that they would continue this conversation and finalize any additional details or recommendations at the February 8 RTO Subcommittee meeting.

#### V. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Chair Kaempff adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

*Meeting packet materials:*

<b>Document Type</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Document Nbr.</b>
Agenda	011112	Agenda, January 11, 2012	011112-rto01
Summary	011112	Meeting Summary, December 14, 2011	011112-rto02
Document	011112	Staff Report, January 11, 2012	011112-rto03
Document	011112	RTO Strategic Plan Matrix Summary	011112-rto04

*Meeting summary respectfully submitted by,*



*Pamela Blackhorse*  
January 11, 2012