



TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE
Sept. 26, 2014
Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT

Karen Buehrig
Lynda David
Chris Deffebach
Adrian Esteban
Carol Gossett
Judith Gray
Eric Hesse
Katherine Kelly
Nancy Kraushaar
Cora Potter
Karen Schilling
Steve White
John Williams

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Mike Clark
Elissa Gertler
Carol Gosset
Susie Lahsene
Heather McCarey
Dave Nordberg
Satvinder Sandhu
Mychal Tetteh
Rian Windsheimer

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Kelly Brooks
Ken Burgstahler
Kathryn Williams
Peter Hurley
Don Odermot
Lainie Smith

AFFILIATION

Clackamas County
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council
Washington County
Community Representative
Community Representative
City of Tigard, representing Cities of Washington Co.
TriMet
City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah Co.
City of Wilsonville, representing Cities of Clackamas Co.
Community Representative
Multnomah County
Community Representative
Metro

AFFILIATION

Washington State Department of Transportation
Metro
Community Representative
Port of Portland
Community Representative
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Federal Highway Administration
Community Representative
Oregon Department of Transportation

AFFILIATION

Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
City of Portland
City of Hillsboro, representing Cities of Washington Co.
Oregon Department of Transportation

STAFF: Kim Ellis, Dan Kaempff, Tom Kloster, Ted Leybold, John Mermin, Chris Myers, Bud Reiff, and Jill Schmidt.

1. CALL TO ORDER, DECLARATION OF A QUORUM & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair John Williams declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Chair Williams updated members on the following items:

- Metro would host a 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) workshop on Monday, Sept. 29 in the Metro Regional Center Council Chamber.
- Mr. Ted Leybold announced that there would be a TransPort meeting on Oct. 8 at Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region 1 from 1 to 2:30 p.m. to discuss the next allocation of flexible funds.
- Mr. Steve White announced that Metro would be hosting Dr. Jim Sallis on Oct. 7 at 9 a.m. as part of the Healthy Community Speaker Series. He stated that details of other free events organized by the Oregon chapter of the American Planning Association were available on the website.

3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON JPACT ITEMS

There were none.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE TPAC MINUTES FOR AUG. 29, 2014

MOTION: Ms. Karen Schilling moved and Ms. Diane McKeel seconded to approve the minutes with the following correction to a scrivener's error:

- Ms. Nancy Kraushaar stated that Cities of Clackamas County would be appointing Ms. Amanda Owens of Lake Oswego as alternate to TPAC.

ACTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

5. UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) AMENDMENT: BEHAVIOR-BASED FREIGHT MODEL

Mr. Chris Myers provided staff's report on the Resolution to amend the Fiscal Year 2013-15 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to add the Behavior-Based Freight Model Project. Mr. Myers explained that the Behavior-Based Freight Model Project was awarded funds by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) after adoption of the FY 2013-15 UPWP. Per federal requirements, all transportation planning projects that are federally funded are required to be included in the UPWP.

Mr. Bud Reiff shared a description of the project which would replace Metro's current trip-based truck model that utilizes fixed commodity flows with a tour-based model designed to reflect decisions made by shoppers, receivers, truck operators, terminal managers and others. This description can be found in Exhibit A.

Staff sought TPAC's recommendation of the resolution to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT).

Member comments included:

- Ms. Schilling inquired whether future Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) funds would be requested. Staff explained that some MTIP funds earmarked for freight data development would be devoted to the current data collection and that Metro would be asking for a portion to go toward the project.
- Ms. Chris Deffebach sought clarification on the commodity flow data to be incorporated into the new model. Staff explained that Metro has used commodity flow data to update the current model and stated that the new model will use some national flow data, but will reflect the entire supply chain worldwide.
- Mr. Peter Hurley inquired about the types of freight the model is anticipated to forecast. Staff explained that the new model would be able to forecast commodity movements, track through trips, and track internal and external flows.

MOTION: Mr. Hurley moved and Mr. Eric Hesse seconded to recommend the resolution to amend the Fiscal Year 2013-15 Unified Planning Work Program to JPACT for consideration.

6. CLIMATE SMART COMMUNITIES SCENARIOS PROJECT: CONTINUE DISCUSSION ON DRAFT IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS TO IDENTIFY PRIORITY TOOLBOX ACTIONS AND OPTIONS

Chair Williams introduced Ms. Kim Ellis to follow up on previous discussions regarding the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project (CSC) and TPAC's final recommendation to JPACT on the components of the adoption package to be considered by Metro Council on Dec. 18.

He reminded TPAC that the Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project was initiated in response to a mandate from the 2009 Oregon Legislature to develop and implement a strategy to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions from cars and small trucks by 20 percent below 2005 levels by 2035. In June, the Metro Council directed staff to test the draft approach as unanimously recommended on May 30 by the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (MPAC) and JPACT. Staff completed the evaluation in August and prepared materials that were released for a 45-day public comment period from Sept. 15 to Oct. 30, 2014. A joint meeting will be held on Nov. 7 for MPAC and JPACT to consider public comments received and continue shaping their final recommendation to the Metro Council.

Ms. Ellis provided an update on the public comment period underway. She explained the public comment period is focused on the following components:

- Key results
- Draft Climate Smart Strategy
- Draft Implementation Recommendations, including draft regional framework plan amendments, draft toolbox of possible actions, and draft performance monitoring approach

Ms. Ellis stated that staff are reviewing comments submitted to identify potential changes to the draft documents for TPAC's consideration on Oct. 31 and Nov. 21. She explained that TPAC will be asked to make a final recommendation to JPACT on Nov. 21. She provided an update the two topics that JPACT and MPAC identified for TPAC and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) to prepare recommendations for the policy committees to discuss at the Nov. 7 joint meeting. The first item is to develop a straw proposal around a short-list of high-return toolbox actions that the

region could pursue together in 2015. She explained the toolbox identifies actions the state, Metro, local governments, and special districts can take to begin implementing the draft approach. The toolbox does not mandate adoption of any particular policy or action, and was developed with the recognition that some tools and actions may work better in some locations than others. The second item is to develop a straw proposal around how the region can demonstrate commitment to follow through on implementing the strategy adopted at the end of the year.

Ms. Ellis stated that Metro will submit all of the components of the adoption package to Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission for approval next year.

Ms. Ellis welcomed member comments on the straw proposal of immediate toolbox actions that the region will work on together in 2015 and 2016 and explained next steps for finalizing the straw proposal for MPAC and JPACT discussion on Nov. 7.

Member comments included:

- Members discussed the criteria and matrix layout for the toolbox that would be most constructive.
- Members indicated there is overall support for the investment amounts recommended in the draft approach and agreed that the toolbox should include the possible actions listed for each of the 10 recommended policy areas.
- Ms. Schilling provided feedback on the content of the materials and urged staff to make levels of investment translatable to priorities.
- Chair Williams inquired about the comfort level of elected officials on the advisory committees with the materials and their comfort to consider the scenario details on Nov. 7. Members communicated the varying levels of familiarity that elected officials may feel with the draft scenario and its components.
- Ms. Deffebach expressed hesitancy to sign up for ongoing reporting and identified funding as the most important priority action.
- Staff recognized the need to better identify the gap between current funding available and funding needed to implement the plan and suggested this would be addressed in more detail as part of the next update to the Regional Transportation Plan.
- Ms. Schilling identified health and equity as two outcomes to better address in the toolbox and monitoring approach. Mr. White provided input for incorporating health and equity. He identified walkability as a useful indicator of health through changes in physical activity and explicit equity recommendations and language to ensure equitable distribution of benefits from investments. Chair Williams stated that Metro's Equity Strategy may contribute to identifying the best equity metric.
- Mr. Hurley reviewed four criteria that he felt summarized comments from members and alternates on how to identify priority actions for 2015 and 2016: produce high greenhouse gas emission reduction, provide multiple community benefits beyond GHG reduction (e.g., safety, public health, equity and the economy), achievable but may require political will, and requires collaboration among multiple partners.
- Member's discussed the utility of identifying actions that require regional action and coherence and actions that can be taken by jurisdictions individually.

- Ms. Katherine Kelly expressed high priority for actions that won't happen without political capital. She stated that co-benefits, safety and health are captured in the current list.

Ms. Ellis opened discussion of what a regional commitment to the adopted plan would look like. She reviewed the four options provided in the memo in the meeting packet [CSC Scenarios Project: Next steps for addressing policy topics prioritized by MPAC and JPACT for further discussion]:

1. A regional compact
2. Metro Council ordinance
3. Local resolutions or other means
4. Letters of support

Chair Williams stated that these options are not mutually exclusive.

Member comments included:

- Members sought clarification on the difference between a signed regional compact and the Metro Council ordinance. Ms. Ellis provided examples of compacts in other regions that express regional commitment to work toward a common vision or strategy.
- Ms. Kraushaar expressed concerns for a regional compact and stated support for letters of support and local resolutions, which would demonstrate local agencies' understanding of responsibilities tailored to individual jurisdictions. She stated her support for informal and individual agreements.
- Mr. Hesse and Ms. Smith supported tailoring regional commitment to the content of the toolbox and recognized priorities identified for 2015 and 2016.

Ms. Ellis clarified that the Oregon Land Conservation and Development Commission is supportive of the project's direction, but seems most concerned about the region's commitment to follow through with implementation.

7. OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REGION 1 AREA COMMISSION ON TRANSPORTATION (ACT)

Mr. Andy Cotugno introduced the discussion on the (ODOT) Region 1 Task Force considering creation of an Area Commissions on Transportation (ACT).

Ms. Kelly Brooks, ODOT Governmental Liaison, provided background on the need for an ACT in Region 1. She explained that the effort historically originated in Clackamas County.

Mr. Cotugno stated that the fundamental discussion underway regards whether to create one ACT or two. He identified population imbalance between urban and rural communities and member representation as challenges. He stated that if two ACTs were formed, one would likely fall around the Metro or JPACT boundary, but the second would be more difficult to define.

Mr. Cotugno informed members that the committee structure is focused around ODOT spending. He stated the Task Force's decision will require reconsideration of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process in place.

Member comments included:

- Ms. Cora Potter expressed concerns for proposed boundaries in western Washington County and stated that separating North Plains from Banks would not be logical.
- Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington County each shared their general positions on the formation of one or two ACTs. Ms. Karen Buehrig stated that Clackamas County's goal is to form an ACT in ODOT Region 1 whether it is one ACT or two for the purpose of discussing STIP project funding with formal committee representation. She expressed the county's historical frustration with not being able to participate since many state highways run through the county. Ms. Schilling noted that Multnomah County has rural areas on both sides of the metropolitan area and the perspective has been to include both pieces of rural area with the urban ACT. Mr. Don Odermott and Ms. Deffebach shared Washington County's position which supports a single ACT to have better broad discussion of priorities across the region.
- Ms. Margi Bradway shared Portland's support for the formation of two ACTs as expressed in a letter from Mayor Hales distributed at the meeting and included in the meeting record.
- Ms. Kraushaar stated that Wilsonville supports two ACTs for its potential to succeed in providing coverage to all areas not currently receiving it.
- In response to member inquiry, Ms. Brooks explained how super ACTs function to represent regions with multiple ACTs to make funding decisions. She stated that no formal super ACT was under consideration by the Task Force.

8. DRAFT URBAN GROWTH REPORT

Mr. Ted Reid provided an overview of the urban growth management decision timeline. He stated that the Urban Growth Report (UGR) considers whether the region has enough room to accommodate the next 20 years of population and employment growth through measurements of supply and demand. He shared an overview of the phases to identify capacity and current ability to accommodate growth. In the first phase, Metro staff conducted extensive technical engagement and peer review to identify the region's buildable land inventory and to complete a population and employment forecast. During the second phase Metro incorporated that work into the draft UGR, which looks at past and future growth. Mr. Reid noted that population growth has a smaller estimated range because it is more predictable than job growth estimates.

Mr. Reid summarized the six steps of the forecast coordination cycle, including: range forecast, UGR, efficiency measures, urban growth boundary amendment if needed, regional forecast distribution to cities and counties, and research and model updates. Mr. Reid shared regional successes and challenges that are taken into account and discussed policy considerations of the process.

Key takeaways included:

- The analysis finds that currently adopted plans can accommodate new housing at the low, middle, or high ends of the growth forecast range.
- If policymakers choose to plan for the high end of the growth range, there is a need for additional capacity for new jobs.


Member comments included:

- Mr. Hurley inquired when in the process the ability to afford low-density infrastructure is taken into account. Mr. Reid responded that local jurisdictions determine where to foster development.
- Mr. Hurley inquired whether the process will consider climate and health implications in decisions for future growth. Chair Williams explained that climate, health, and equity are not talked about as explicitly in the UGR as in CSC Scenarios Project.
- Members and staff clarified that Council will take into account the policy considerations mentioned after the UGR is adopted.
- Ms. Kraushaar noted outcomes of the residential preference survey and expressed the need to provide employment near housing.

9. **ADJOURN**

Chair Williams adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. Schmidt".

Jill Schmidt, Council Policy Assistant

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF SEPT. 26, 2014

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOC DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
6.0	Handout	Fall 2014	Climate Smart Communities (CSC) Scenarios Project Key Results	92614t-01
6.0	Handout	Fall 2014	CSC Public Comment Period Flyer	92614t -02
6.0	Handout	9/15/14	Draft Climate Smart Strategy	92614t -03
6.0	Handout	9/15/14	CSC Draft Regional Framework Plan Amendments; Public Review Draft	92614t -04
6.0	Handout	9/15/14	CSC Draft Toolbox Actions 2015-20; Public Review Draft	92614t-05
6.0	Handout	9/15/14	CSC Draft Performance Monitoring Approach; Public Review Draft	92614t-06
7.0	Handout	9/2/14	Options for Establishing an ODOT Region 1 Area Commission on Transportation (ACT)	92614t-07
7.0	Handout	N/A	ODOT Region 1 ACT Option Maps	92614t-08
7.0	Presentation	N/A	1 ACT? 2 ACT?	92614t-09
7.0	Handout	9/11/14	Handout: Letter from Mayor Charlie Hales; Portland	92614t-10
8.0	Presentation	N/A	2015 Growth Management Decision	92614t-11