



Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Metro Technical Advisory Committee
 Date: Wednesday, May 7, 2014
 Time: 10 a.m. to noon
 Place: Council Chamber

Time	Agenda Item	Action Requested	Presenter(s)	Materials
10:00 a.m.	CALL TO ORDER Updates from the Chair	Information	John Williams, Chair	In packet
	Citizen Comments to MTAC Agenda Items	Information	All	
10:10	Regional Active Transportation Plan: Draft adoption resolution and public comments received to-date <i>Objective: MTAC provides feedback on draft resolution and comments received to date</i>	Information/ Feedback	Lake McTighe, Metro	In packet
10:30	2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP: Environmental Justice and Title VI Analysis Scope and Process <i>Objective: Inform MTAC members of the scope of work and process for the analysis</i>	Information	Ted Leybold, Metro	In packet
Noon	Adjourn			

(Continued)

Metro's nondiscrimination notice

Metro respects civil rights. Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which bans discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin. For more information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a Title VI complaint form, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536.

Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings.

All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1536 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 10 business days in advance of the meeting to accommodate your request. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at www.trimet.org.

2014 MTAC Tentative Agendas
As of 5/1/14

<p>May 21 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from the Chair: 2014 RTP Process Update/Share air quality conformity results • Climate Smart Communities: MTAC makes recommendation to JPACT on preferred approach • Discussion of SW Corridor Steering Committee recommendation 	<p>June 4 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW Corridor Steering Committee recommendation to MPAC
<p>June 18 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation to MPAC on ATP adoption resolution • Recommendation to MPAC on 2014 RTP ordinance 	<p>July 2 MTAC meeting</p>
<p>July 16 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Smart Communities: discuss proposed RFP amendments and near-term implementation recommendations 	<p>August 6 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Smart Communities: discuss proposed RFP amendments and near-term implementation recommendations
<p>August 20 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: draft 2014 Urban Growth Report 	<p>September 3 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: Residential Preference Survey • Climate Smart Communities: discuss evaluation results and public review of draft preferred approach
<p>September 17 MTAC meeting</p>	<p>October 1 MTAC meeting</p>
<p>October 15 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: 2014 Urban Growth Report (recommendations to MPAC) • Climate Smart Communities: discuss public comments & begin discussion of recommendations to MPAC 	<p>November 5 MTAC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2015 Growth Management Decision: 2014 Urban Growth Report (recommendations to MPAC) • Climate Smart Communities: discuss public comments & begin discussion of recommendation to MPAC

November 19 MTAC meeting	December 3 MTAC meeting
December 17 MTAC meeting	***



Date: April 24, 2014
To: MTAC and Interested Parties
From: Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Plan, Metro
Re: Regional Active Transportation Plan: draft adoption resolution and public comments received to date

Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to provide for MTAC's consideration and feedback draft language for the resolution proposing adoption of the Regional Active Transportation Plan ("ATP") in July, 2014. Also provided are comments received to date through the March 21-May 5 public comment period.

Background

A draft ATP (dated February 2014) was released for public review and comment on March 21, 2014. The draft plan reflects input from a variety of stakeholders including a Stakeholder Advisory Committee, a regional work group with over forty participants, the Metro Council and Metro's advisory committees.

Track-changes and clean copy versions of the draft ATP are available to review on Metro's website:

www.oregonmetro.gov/activetransportationplan.

Draft adoption resolution

Metro is proposing that the ATP be adopted by Resolution. A draft of the Resolution for consideration and input is attached. A response to frequently asked questions regarding adoption of the ATP by resolution is also attached.

Next steps – Metro advisory committee and council meetings

Note that some dates have changed from previous calendars. Staff will not be seeking *preliminary* approval from MPAC and JPACT and the proposed adoption date has moved to July 31.

April 25 TPAC- Provide feedback on ATP public comments and draft adoption resolution

May 7 MTAC- Provide feedback on ATP public comments and draft adoption resolution

May 21 MTAC- Tentative meeting hold if needed for further discussion

May 23 TPAC – Tentative meeting hold if needed for further discussion

June 18 MTAC – Recommendation to MPAC on Final ATP adoption requested

June 24 Metro Council work session- Overview of final ATP proposed for adoption

June 25 MPAC - Recommendation to Metro Council on ATP adoption requested

June 27 TPAC – Recommendation to JPACT on Final ATP adoption requested

July 10 JPACT - Approval of ATP adoption resolution requested

July 31 Metro Council –Action on ATP resolution

BEFORE THE METRO COUNCIL

FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE) RESOLUTION NO. 14-XXXX
REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION)
PLAN) Introduced by XXXXXXXXX
)

WHEREAS, planning and implementing a regional active transportation network, including streets with complete pedestrian and bicycle facilities, trails and access to transit, is a component of regional and local plans to develop vibrant, prosperous and sustainable communities with safe and reliable transportation choices, that minimize greenhouse gas emissions and that distribute the benefits and burdens of development equitably in the region; and

WHEREAS, on June 10, 2010 the Metro Council, with the advice and support of the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (“MPAC”) and the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (“JPACT”), adopted the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (“RTP”) by Ordinance No. 10-1241B; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 RTP identified development of a Regional Active Transportation Plan (“ATP”) as an implementation activity as a critical part of the RTP strategy to achieve local and regional aspirations, goals and targets; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2011 the Metro Council adopted Resolution No. 11-4239, which expressed the Metro Council’s support for development of the ATP and directed the Metro Chief Operating Officer to seek a grant to help fund the ATP; and

WHEREAS, in 2012 Metro formed a Stakeholder Advisory Committee (“SAC”) with representatives from Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, the Oregon Department of Transportation (“ODOT”), TriMet, the cities of Forest Grove, Gresham, Hillsboro, Portland, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, Elders in Action, Upstream Public Health, the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, and Oregon Walks to guide development of the ATP; and

WHEREAS, a draft ATP was produced in July 2013; and

WHEREAS, on September 26, 2013 the Metro Council, with the advice and support of MPAC and JPACT, adopted Resolution No. 13-4454, which acknowledged work completed to date on the draft ATP and directed Metro staff to work with stakeholders to further refine the plan and to prepare amendments to the RTP for final public review as part of the RTP update in 2014; and

WHEREAS, Metro sought input to further refine the ATP from the Metro Council, JPACT, MPAC, the Transportation Policy Advisory Committee (“TPAC”) and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (“MTAC”), and a regional work group comprised of staff and representatives from the original SAC, Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties, the cities of Cornelius, Beaverton, Fairview, Forest Grove, Gresham, Happy Valley, Hillsboro, Milwaukie, Portland, Sherwood, Tigard, Troutdale, Tualatin, Wilsonville, ODOT, TriMet, Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District, Safe Routes to School National Partnership, 1,000 Friends of Oregon, the Bicycle Transportation Alliance, Oregon Walks, and other stakeholders (“regional partners”); and

WHEREAS, Metro refined the ATP to reflect the input from regional partners; and

WHEREAS, Metro sought additional comments on the ATP during the public review comment period from March 21 to May 5, 2014; and

WHEREAS, Metro provided responses to comments received during the public review comment period, which are set forth in the “Regional Active Transportation Public Comment Report,” attached as Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, the ATP is intended to function as a guiding document that provides a vision, policies and a plan to support local jurisdictions and regional partners in achieving regional and local goals, performance targets and aspirations, but is not a component of the RTP and does not itself create binding obligations on local governments; and

WHEREAS, the ATP includes recommended updates to the RTP regional pedestrian and bicycle network concepts, network concept maps, functional classifications, and policies that, if they are adopted as part of the 2014 RTP update, will require local governments to update their plans and codes to be consistent with the 2014 RTP, and will help achieve the region’s Six Desired Outcomes and RTP goals, objectives and performance targets; and

WHEREAS, the updates to the RTP recommended by the ATP are included in the proposed 2014 RTP update, recommended for adoption by Ordinance No. 14-XXXX; and

WHEREAS, local jurisdictions and agencies submitted pedestrian and bicycle projects to the 2014 RTP that help complete the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks and programs identified in the ATP; and

WHEREAS, the Metro Council dedicated funding July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2015 to support finalizing and implementation of the ATP; and

WHEREAS, JPACT and MPAC recommend adoption of the Regional Active Transportation Plan as revised and attached as Exhibit A; NOW THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED that the Metro Council:

1. Adopts the Regional Active Transportation Plan attached as Exhibit A to serve as guidance for development and completion of the regional active transportation network to achieve identified desired outcomes; and
2. Directs Metro staff to begin implementing the Regional Active Transportation Plan through the Regional Transportation Plan and other efforts.

ADOPTED by the Metro Council this 17 day of July, 2014.

Tom Hughes, Council President

Approved as to form:

Alison Kean Campbell, Metro Attorney



Regional Transportation Legislation FAQ

This document provides responses to frequently asked questions regarding the upcoming proposed adoption of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP).

1. ***How is the Regional Transportation Plan adopted?*** The RTP is a component of the Regional Framework Plan (RFP), which is a governing document for the Metro region that carries the force and effect of law. When the Metro Council adopts amendments or updates to the RTP or other components of the RFP, following recommendations from JPACT and MPAC, it is adopting legislation that must be adopted by Ordinance. The effect of the Ordinance is a land use decision that creates legally binding requirements on local governments in the region.
2. ***How will the Regional Active Transportation Plan be adopted?*** The ATP is a guidance plan that provides policy direction and recommendations for the region to help implement the RTP. The ATP is being proposed for adoption by Resolution, because the plan consists of recommendations that do not impose binding obligations on local governments. However, key elements of the ATP that will create legal obligations on local jurisdictions are being incorporated into the 2014 RTP amendments. The ATP pedestrian and bicycle network concepts, maps and functional classifications will replace the concepts, maps and functional classifications in the existing RTP. RTP regional pedestrian and bicycle policies are updated based on policy recommendations in the ATP. Adoption of the ATP by Resolution expresses the intent of the Metro Council and the region to support and implement the ATP, and is appropriate for a plan that provides guidance and policy direction.
3. ***Why is the ATP being proposed for adoption by resolution when past modal plans (Freight, HCT, TSMO) were adopted by Ordinance as components of the RTP?*** Adopting stand alone modal plans, such as the ATP, by Resolution is more consistent with the purpose of the plans and how they will be implemented over time. Metro will recommend adopting future new and updated modal plans by Resolution, with key elements being incorporated into future RTP amendments via Ordinance. Regional pedestrian and bicycle elements of the RTP that are required by the Transportation Planning Rule are being updated with the new ATP provisions.
4. ***What happens when modal plans that were previously adopted by Ordinance are updated?*** Metro will recommend that when existing modal plans are updated, or new modal plans are developed, that these be adopted by Resolution, consistent with the approach being used for the ATP. And, like the ATP, elements of standalone modal plans be incorporated into the RTP during regular RTP updates.
5. ***What is the impact to local Transportation System Plans and the RTP if the ATP is updated?*** If Metro updates the ATP local jurisdictions may incorporate elements of the updated ATP into TSP updates but will not be required to do so. New information from the updated ATP, such as network map or policy direction, will be considered for incorporation into future RTP updates.

Public Comments on Draft ATP received as of April 24, 2014

A 45-day public comment period for the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Active Transportation Plan (February 2014 draft), and the 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, began March 21 and will conclude May 5, 2014. Metro has received comments through an online survey available at www.makingagreatplace.org and from comments sent directly to staff via email. As of April 24, 2014 Metro has received the following comments on the draft ATP. (Comments on the draft 2014 Regional Transportation Plan related to active transportation are not included below; those comments are included in the RTP public comment report. Comments on pedestrian and bicycle network maps are included in both the ATP and RTP comment log, as those comments refer to maps in both plans.)

ATP Public Comment Log March 21-May 5, 2014

#	Comment	Source(s)	Date	Staff Recommendation
1	Recommend that the streets below be designated as Regional Pedestrian Corridors On-street 1) Park Avenue from River Road east across McLoughlin to Oatfield Road 2) Courtney Avenue from River Road east to Oatfield Road 3) Oak Grove Blvd from River Road east to Rupert Drive to Oatfield Road 4) Concord Road from River Road east to Oatfield Road 5) Roethe Road from River Road east to Oatfield Road 6) Jennings Avenue from River Road east to McLoughlin (area east is designated appropriately)	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	Staff is still reviewing some of the proposed changes. 1) Add Park Avenue segment as requested; segment is partially within and connects to a station area which is also a regional pedestrian and bicycle district.
2	1) Hwy 224 is designated as a Pedestrian Parkway On-street. Is this correct? It should be designated as a Pedestrian Parkway Off-street facility. 2) Add Regional multiuse path (Off-street connection) from Sunnybrook Blvd west of 82nd Avenue (below the Aquatic Park Center) connecting to Harmony Road 3) Fuller Road from Harmony Road north to 82nd Avenue – designate Regional Pedestrian Corridor On-street 4) Hwy 212/224 from I-205 multiuse path east to 122nd Avenue - designate Regional Pedestrian Corridor On-street; from MS/SM Trail at Hwy 212/224 near Orchard View Lane east to 172nd Avenue – designate Pedestrian Parkway matching designation adjacent (to the west) and to the east 5) 132nd Avenue from Hubbard north to Sunnyside Road – designate Regional Pedestrian Corridor On-street	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	1) Keep designation as on-street, except where the Sunrise Corridor Trail parallel to Hwy 224 is shown. The Clackamas River Greenway is identified on the Regional Trails Map parallel to Hwy 224, but is not envisioned as a transportation trail and is not included on the current or proposed ATP and RTP bicycle or pedestrian maps. The Sunrise Corridor Trail is included. 2) Add to ATP pedestrian and bicycle maps as recommended. 3) Add as recommended. 4) Add as recommended. 5) Add as recommended.

3	Remove Hwy 224 as Regional Pedestrian Corridor outside of UGB (near Richardson Creek Natural Area)	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	Change as requested will be made.
4	The County ATP has the Newell Creek Trail as a Principle Active Transportation route. The Regional ATP doesn't show Newell Creek Trail. It shows Newell Creek Canyon and Beaver Lake Trail. Isn't Metro purchasing property in this area? The County recommends that the Newell Creek Trail be designated as a Regional Pedestrian Corridor.	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	The trail that you referto as the Newell Creek Trail is on the ATP pedestrian and bicycle maps, but is labeled as the Beaver Lake Trail. This a naming issue - the same trail has different names. Metro's trail department will be reviewing and cleaning up naming issues to reduce confusion.
5	1) Designate Oak Grove Blvd from River Road east to Oatfield Road as a Regional Bikeway On-street 2) Designate Concord from River Road east to Oatfield to Thiessen Road as a Regional Bikeway On-street. 3) Designate Naef Road from River Road to Oatfield to Oetkin Road to Thiessen Road as a Bicycle Parkway Old River Road to Mapleton to Hwy 43 south is one of the County's Principal Active Transportation routes. 4) Old River Road to Mapleton to Hwy 43 is one of the County's Principal Active Transportation routes. Designate Mapleton as a Regional Bikeway On-street.	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	1) Staff is still reviewing some of the proposed changes. 2) Staff is still reviewing some of the proposed changes. 3) Staff is still reviewing some of the proposed changes. 4) Mapleton is currently designated as a Regional Bikeway on-street, consistent with the request.
6	1) Designate Monroe Street as a Bicycle Parkway in Milwaukie and east of Linnwood Avenue connecting east of 82nd Avenue to Phillips Creek Trail 2) Add Regional multiuse path (Off-street connection) from Sunnybrook Blvd west of 82nd Avenue (below the Aquatic Park Center) connecting to Harmony Road 3) Designate Strawberry Lane from Webster to Evelyn Street as a Regional Bikeway 4) Designate Hwy 224 south of Hwy 212/224 split to Clackamas River/Springwater Road as a Bicycle Parkway	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	Staff is reviewing the proposed changes.
7	1) The river crossing south of Wilsonville) is clearly shown (on Pedestrian Network not Bicycle) but not the French Prairie Bridge, why? 2) Designate Redland Road from Hwy 213/Oregon Trail Barlow Road Trail east to UGB as a Regional Bikeway	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	3/20/2014	1) The French Prairie Bridge is part of both the ATP pedestrian and bicycle networks. It is a mapping error that it was left off of the bicycle map. The error will be corrected. 2) Staff is still reviewing some of the proposed changes.

8	<p>1) Designate SW Stephenson St, SW 35th Ave, Huber St west to Capitol Hwy as Regional Pedestrian Corridors and as Regional Bikeways. (There is a large gap between SW 49th and the Hillsdale to Lake Oswego Trail. This will help fill the gap and provide connectivity.) The routes from Boones Ferry Rd, Stephenson, 35th, Huber, and Capitol Hwy to Barbur Blvd provide connections to multiple destinations and transit stops in the area including Tryon State Park, Stephenson Elementary School (which doubles as a neighborhood park), Jackson Middle School (which doubles as a community park), residential uses (multifamily and single family dwellings), churches, and many services on Capitol Hwy and Barbur Blvd.</p> <p>2) Designate SW Vermont St and SW 45th Ave as a Regional Pedestrian Corridors and Regional Bikeways. The routes along Vermont and 45th provide connections to multiple destinations and transit stops in the area including Gabriel Park, SW Community Center, residential uses (multifamily and single family dwellings), neighborhood commercial uses (medical services, offices and retail uses) and churches in the area.</p>	Lori Mastrantonio-Meuseur (citizen comment)	3/25/2014	1) Staff is still reviewing the proposed changes. 2) SW Vermont is currently designated a Regional Bikeway between the Hillsdale Town Center and SW Oleson Road. Staff is reviewing the other proposed changes.
9	The ATP contains virtually no mention of an aging population, except for a tiny mention on 2-37 and 2-38. This is a crucial component to consider in the ATP, and more thought should be given to how access can be improved for the aged in our community.	Sean Carey	4/10/2014	Add additional reference to aging population where appropriate. The term "all ages and abilities" is used frequently throughout the ATP; where appropriate this language will be enlarged upon to illustrate that it includes seniors.
10	Replace the term "disabled" with the term "people with disabilities"	Claudia Robertson	4/14/2014	Change will be made throughout document.
11	Please designate the SE Reedway Street right-of-way between SE 23rd Avenue and SE 28th Avenue in Portland as a Regional Pedestrian Corridor and a Regional Bikeway. Currently these designations are shown between 26th and 28th avenues only.	Steve Svigethy (citizen comment)	4/15/2014	Make correction to ATP pedestrian and bicycle network map as proposed. This connection is consistent with City of Portland plans and was intended to be included on the regional maps but was inadvertently left out.
12	We'd like to add the (Clackamas Regional Center) CRC I-205 ped/bike bridge crossing near Sunnyside Road to the Bike and Ped Maps. It is on the constrained Draft RTP project list (Project 11495; Ped/Bike I-205 overpass).	Clackamas County, Lori Mastrantonio-Meuser	4/15/2014	Change will be made as requested.

13	p. 10-141, 1st full para. "By 2035, increase by XX percent the miles of completed trails, bikeways, sidewalks, and transit stops on the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks compared to 2010." This assumes that all miles are equally valuable, but we know some will be more useful than others. Is there a way to prioritize them, or reference an existing priority system?	Carol Chesarek	4/22/2014	This performance target is from the Regional Transportation Plan. This observation will be provided to the staff that will be working on performance measures prior to the update of the 2014 RTP (in 2018). This is a good observation, though the performance target is the necessarily the place to reflect priorities. The ATP does not prioritize projects, but does provide recommendations in Chapter 14 on ways to prioritize moving forward.
14	p. 10-141, Access to Daily Needs. Is this about daily needs, or about equity? Ped options aren't mentioned, and the sentence needs some work to make the meaning clear. "By 2035, increase by 50 percent the number of essential destinations including jobs and education accessible in less than 30 minutes by transit, and the number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by bicycling and public transit for low income, minority, senior and disabled populations, compared to 2005." It isn't clear if access for the disadvantaged is to be measured by bicycling and public transit use combined, or if it is for bicycling (alone) and public transit (alone), or both alone and together? I'm not sure the best way to fix this because I'm not sure what the intent is, or why ped options aren't included.	Carol Chesarek	4/22/2014	This performance target is from the Regional Transportation Plan and is going to be reviewed and worked on prior to the update of the 2014 RTP (in 2018). The target needs work, both on how it is defined and also the methodology. I will add your comments to that discussion. Clarifying language will be added.
15	p. 10-142, #11. "More projects intersect with high value habitat." I can't tell if you are saying this should be encouraged or minimized. This should be minimized. This is a performance measure from the RTP and measures all projects (roadway, bike and ped, etc) so includes more than trails, bike and ped projects. I'd argue that we should keep people out of high value habitats, because the presence of humans disturbs many forms of wildlife. If you want to encourage projects that provide access to nature, it would be best to aim them for habitats that are lower value (which may also include opportunities for habitat enhancement to offset the harm of human intrusion).	Carol Chesarek	4/22/2014	This is from a summary of the results from the performance measure evaluation of the 2035 RTP. Impact to high value habitat should be minimized. Clarifying language will be added.

16	11-147, (d). "Non-white householders" Can we differentiate among non-whites, or are they all similarly poor users of walking, biking, and transit? I hate to assume that non-whites are all the same. In looking at the following measures (e, f, and g), I also started to wonder how many of these conditions are related. For example, I can imagine that the low-income population might be more often non-white, disabled, and/or younger, which made me wonder how these measures overlap (are we counting the same folks multiple times, and is that overlap helpful?). Also, in (c) and (d) there are suggested actions ("Support continuation of these trends by..."). These suggestions are missing from e, f, and g. Are these all trends we want to encourage, or just to note some?	Carol Chesarek	4/22/2014	The data that you refer to indicates that non-white householders walk, bike and take transit more than white householders (Oregon Household Activity Survey 2011). The data is not broken out by different ethnicities or races. There are many ways that the data can be analyzed. This section provides broad brush information to give a sense of trends in the region. The sections that referenced that do not include suggestions will be reviewed and suggestions will be added if possible.
17	14-188. Halfway down, "NW Bethany Blvd. - NW German Town Rd to NW Cornell" This is the project description that you fixed so that it runs from Cornell only to the county lin.	Carol Chesarek	4/22/2014	Change made, thank you for catching th mistake.
18	<p>Oregon Walks is dedicated to promoting walking and making the conditions for walking safe, convenient and attractive for everyone. The Metro 2014 Regional Transportation Plan supports those same goals on an equal footing with other modes in a balanced, multi-modal, long term regional transportation plan. The Regional Active Transportation Plan provides a clear vision and policy direction for the future regional pedestrian system, recognizing the importance of convenient, safe, and direct access to destinations, including safe crossings of busy roads, and separation from fast moving vehicles.</p> <p>Oregon Walks recommends adoption of the Regional Active Transportation Plan and associated RTP amendments, and hopes that the counties and cities of the region will implement the plan both in spirit and in action.</p>	Oregon Walks, Plans and Projects Committee, submitted by Rod Yoder	4/24/2014	The comments will be added to both the RTP and ATP public comment reports which will be provided to the MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council prior to these plans being proposed for adoption.



Date: April 30, 2014
To: Metro Technical Advisory Committee and Interested Parties
From: Ted Leybold, Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Manager
Grace Cho, Assistant Transportation Planner
Subject: 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI Assessment – Scope of Analysis and Process Schedule

Purpose

To provide an understanding of the analysis, public comment and adoption process in preparation for adoption of the final report findings and recommendations scheduled for JPACT and Council consideration in July 2014.

Background

As a metropolitan planning organization, part of the region's federal obligations requires Metro to conduct an Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment of the agency's transportation planning and programming activities. Therefore, a component of the 2014 RTP update and the 2015-2018 MTIP is an investment analysis which assesses where transportation investments are being made relative to the locations of five identified communities of concern.

MTAC will be provided information about the process and schedule for the analysis to prepare for the upcoming public comment period. The input received during the public comment period is intended to help shape findings and recommendations for consideration by JPACT and the Metro Council. Regional discussions will kick off with a public comment period schedule for mid-May 2014.

The 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI Assessment fulfills federal requirements, but is also relevant to the work being conducted through Metro's Equity Strategy. Transportation planning staff is coordinating with Metro Equity Strategy staff to identify areas where work may support both programs, but also proceeding to meet federal requirements for the RTP and MTIP as the regional equity strategy is finalized.

Contents and Framework of Assessment

The 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment is staged in three phases. The first phase involved determining the definitions, thresholds, and overall methodology for the assessment.

The second phase illustrates the results of the methodology applied to the region's short-term (via the 2015-2018 MTIP) and long-term (via the 2014 RTP) transportation investments. The analysis will examine where transportation investments are being proposed relative to concentrations of communities of concern within the region. The assessment uses benchmarks of transportation investment per person per acre to determine if there are disproportionate investments.

The third phase focuses on understanding the how the transportation investments proposed for the region in the short-term and the long-term affect communities of concern at a programmatic level.

Public Comment Period and Final Report

Survey results and comments at the TriMet community forums indicated that whether a transportation investment is perceived as a benefit or a burden depends greatly on the context of each individual or community. This is why summary of the public comments about the short and long-term investment analysis and program is a critical component to the final report and its recommendations.

The following items related to the 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment are being prepared for the public comment period:

- Maps of transportation investments in the region for the 2014 RTP and the 2015-2018 MTIP
- Demographic maps showing where concentrations of environmental justice communities are located within the region.
- Summary of potential burdens and benefits associated with transportation investments.
- Summary of short and long-term transportation investments relative to environmental justice and Title VI communities with data findings.

To understand the how the transportation investments proposed for the region in the short-term and the long-term affect environmental justice communities at a programmatic level the following questions will be asked:

- 1) What are the different positive and negative experiences environmental justice and Title VI communities experience with different transportation investments? (See Attachment A for a list of potential experiences)
- 2) At a programmatic scale, (not project-specific) what can the region do to help reduce disproportionate negative impacts on environmental justice communities and eliminate disparate impacts? Which can be implemented in the short-term? Which can be implemented and monitored over time?

The feedback will help gather a greater understanding of the positive and negative effects environmental justice communities may experience with transportation investments in the short and long-term. Based on the analysis and the feedback received through the public engagement process, findings and recommendations of regional strategies to address disproportionate burdens or disparate impacts will be developed for consideration by JPACT and the Metro Council.

Schedule

The following is the schedule of engagement to be conducted as part of the assessment.

Activity	Date
Presentation of 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment scope of process to TPAC	March 28, 2014
Discussion with stakeholders to review assessment method	April 2, 2014
Presentation of 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment scope and process to JPACT	April 10, 2014
Presentation of 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment scope and process with Metro Council	April 22, 2014
Presentation of 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment scope and process to MTAC	May 7, 2014
Presentation of 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment scope and process to MPAC	May 14, 2014
Release of Draft 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment for public comment	May 16, 2014
Close of Public Comment	June 15, 2014
Develop findings and recommendations for the 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment	June 2014
Presentation of findings and recommendations from the 2014 RTP and	June 24, 2014

2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment with Metro Council	
Presentation of findings and recommendations from the 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment to TPAC – Recommendation to JPACT requested	June 27, 2014
Presentation of findings and recommendations from the 2014 RTP and 2015-2018 MTIP Environmental Justice and Title VI assessment to JPACT – Recommendation to Metro Council requested	July 10, 2014
Metro Council Adoption by Resolution	July 17, 2014

Potential impacts, effects and outcomes of transportation investments on environment justice communities

Potential impacts	Potential effects	Potential outcomes (benefits and burdens analysis component)
Change in access to employment, services or social/community assets	Transportation investment could increase access to employment, essential services or community assets	Increased opportunities for employment, access to services and/or cohesiveness of the community
	Transportation investment could present a new or increased barrier to accessing employment, essential services or community assets	Decreased opportunities for employment, access to services and/or cohesiveness of the community
Change in property values	Transportation investment could increase property values in the vicinity of the projects.	<p>Increased wealth for property owner community members</p> <p>Increased opportunities to finance new housing and retail options in the community</p> <p>Increased housing costs and displacement for renters</p> <p>Accelerated rate of change in built environment and community demographics that impact community identity and cohesiveness (gentrification).</p>
	Transportation investment could decrease property values in the vicinity of the projects.	<p>Decrease in wealth of property owners.</p> <p>Disinvestment in community assets and economic opportunity.</p> <p>Increased concentration of poverty.</p>
Exposure to environmental impacts (emissions, noise, and visual impacts)	Transportation investment could increase exposure to negative environmental impacts or decrease positive environmental impacts in the vicinity of the projects.	Health impacts and costs associated with exposure to emissions, decreased activity and stress.
	Transportation investment could decrease exposure to negative environmental impacts or increase positive environmental impacts in the vicinity of the project.	Improved health and lower costs associated with less exposure to negative environmental impacts.
Safety and security	Transportation investment could increase exposure to safety and security issues in the vicinity of the projects.	<p>Potential increase in crash and fatality rates.</p> <p>Potential increase in criminal activity</p>
	Transportation investment could decrease exposure to safety and security issues in the vicinity of the projects.	<p>Potential decrease in crash and fatality rates.</p> <p>Potential decrease in criminal activity.</p>