

Metro | Agenda

Meeting: Metro Technical Advisory Committee
Date: August 3, 2016
Time: 10:00 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		John Williams, Chair	
	Citizen Communications to MTAC		All	
90 min.	Urban Growth Management Readiness Task Force <i>Purpose: Discussion and feedback to Urban Growth Management Readiness Task Force</i>	Recommendation	Ted Reid, Metro	
Noon	Adjourn			

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 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.

2016 MTAC Tentative Agendas

January 6 – Cancelled	January 20 • Housing Equity
February 3 – Cancelled	February 17 – Cancelled
March 2 • Urban Growth Management Update • 2018 RTP Update: 2016 Activities & Milestones • 2018 RTP Update: Background for Regional Leadership Forum #1 • Metro Equity Strategy • Title 13 Progress Report	March 16 • Growth Distribution • Sherwood West Concept Planning work
April 6 – Cancelled	April 20 • Metro Equity Strategy Final Report
May 4 – Cancelled	May 18 – Cancelled
June 1 • 2018 RTP Update • Metro Equity Strategy • Urban Growth Management Update • Affordable Housing Grants Update	June 15 - Cancelled
July 6 • Happy Valley CPDG Project Update • Revised Growth Forecast Distribution • Urban Growth Management Readiness TF update	July 13 – Special Meeting • Recommendation on Urban Growth Management Readiness Task Force work plan to MPAC
July 20 – Cancelled	August 3 • MTAC feedback to Urban Growth Management Readiness TF work plan
August 17 • 2018 RTP: Background for Regional Leadership Forum # 2 • 2018 RTP: Transportation Equity Priority Outcomes draft RTP Revenue Forecast • 2018 RTP: Project Solicitation Approach	September 7
September 21 • 2018 RTP: Draft RTP Performance Targets and Measures • 2018 RTP: Draft Regional Freight Needs • City of Vancouver Affordable Housing Initiative presentation • City of Vancouver Columbia River Waterfront presentation	October 5 • 2018 RTP: Draft Regional Transit Vision and Measures
October 19 • 2018 RTP: Background for Regional Leadership Forum #3 • 2018 RTP: Performance Targets and Measures • City of Vancouver Westside Mobility Strategy presentation • City of Vancouver Fourth Plain Forward & Business District presentation	November 2 • 2018 RTP: Safety Strategies and Outcomes
November 16	December 7
December 21	***

Parking Lot – Future Agenda Items

- Bonny Slope and North Bethany update
- ODOT Highway Performance Measures Project

Parking Lot – Future Events

- Sept. 23, 2016 – RTP Regional Leadership Forum #2; Navigating our Transportation Funding Landscape
- Dec. 2, 2016 – RTP Regional Leadership Forum #3; Transforming our Vision into Regional Priorities



Date: July 27, 2016
To: Metro Technical Advisory Committee
From: Ted Reid, Principal Regional Planner
Re: Urban Growth Management Readiness Task Force – draft staff suggestions

Introduction

The Metro Council has convened an Urban Growth Readiness Task Force. The task force has been asked to provide recommendations for how the Metro Council could exercise flexibility in responding to city requests for modest residential urban growth boundary (UGB) adjustments into urban reserves when cities demonstrate that they can govern the area and finance infrastructure and services and when the adjustment would advance regional and local goals.

Recent policy direction from the task force and the Metro Council

At its June 22, 2016 meeting the task force requested staff suggestions in two general categories:

- Defining expectations for cities requesting modest urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions.
- Identifying additional mechanisms for adjusting the UGB.

At its July 13, 2016 meeting, MTAC discussed initial staff recommendations on these topics. Staff summarized MTAC's discussion in a July 14 memo that was taken to a July 19, 2016 Metro Council work session. The Metro Council indicated general support for the direction of the work, expressing the following points:

- The UGB should only be expanded when there is a demonstrated need.
- The UGB exchange concept is worth discussing further. If the Council pursues the exchange concept, it expects a public engagement effort with property owners and local jurisdictions that would be affected.
- The Metro Council should not consider city requests for UGB expansions on an annual basis (too frequent).
- Staff and MTAC suggestions on how to define expectations for cities requesting modest UGB expansions are generally on the right track. Possible implications for nearby unincorporated areas should be considered as well. Staff and MTAC's initial recommendations are described in the July 14 memo to the task force and generally include:
 - Changes to Title 11 (Planning for New Urban Areas) are not needed at this time.
 - A holistic approach makes sense – cities should demonstrate that they are meeting baseline requirements in their existing city boundaries (not just in concept plan areas).
 - Consider amendments to the Functional Plan that place the following requirements on cities requesting UGB expansions:

- § A city should have an acknowledged housing needs analysis per Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing) that is coordinated with Metro’s most recent forecast.
- § A city should demonstrate that it is in compliance with the state’s Metropolitan Housing Rule regarding densities and the mix of housing.
- § A city should take the actions described in Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (Centers, Corridors, Station Communities, and Main Streets) that are currently required for eligibility for “regional investments.”
- § A city should demonstrate that it has implemented best practices such as those documented in Metro’s Equitable Housing Initiative.

After the July 19 work session, Metro Council President Hughes requested that staff work with MTAC to flesh out additional suggestions on possible mechanisms for adjusting the UGB. Mechanisms for addressing the task force’s problem statement may exist under existing legal authority – pending additional policy direction to staff – or may require changes to state law. The July task force meeting has been postponed until September to allow staff and MTAC to develop additional suggestions. All of these concepts are predicated on the acknowledgement of urban and rural reserves.

Possible UGB adjustment mechanisms within existing legal authority

Under existing state law, UGB expansions may only be made when there is a demonstrated regional need for additional land for growth. The Metro Council has indicated that it wishes to maintain this basic tenet regarding need whether or not legislative changes are sought. In this context, staff has two suggestions that fall within Metro’s existing legal authority, pending additional policy direction to staff:

- Use the UGB exchange process, which results in no net increase in the number of buildable acres inside the UGB.
- Consider additional policy objectives when calculating regional needs in an urban growth report (UGR).

UGB exchange

The UGB exchange process has been explored to some extent in previous discussions and in staff’s July 14 memo to the task force. Staff believes that additional discussion of the concept should cover:

- Changes to Metro’s code to amend existing acreage limits on UGB exchanges. Staff suggests increasing or removing the acreage limit in Metro’s code.
- The public and local jurisdiction engagement process needed for a UGB exchange.
- Possible refinements to state administrative rules (discussed later in this memo).
- The circumstances under which areas would be considered for removal from the UGB. If, for example, 15 years have passed since the UGB expansion was acknowledged by the state, factors for considering removal from the UGB could include:
 - Whether the area is within a city boundary or a county has taken planning and governance responsibility.
 - Whether urban-level comprehensive plan designations have been adopted.
 - Whether it appears likely that the area will develop in the foreseeable future.

Consideration of additional policy objectives when calculating regional needs

Policy makers may wish to provide additional direction on their policy objectives that relate to regional land needs that are calculated in urban growth reports. Staff suggests discussion of the amount of seven-county household growth for which the Metro region is taking responsibility (the UGB “capture rate”).

The amount of residential growth that may go to neighboring areas (e.g., Sandy, Canby, Estacada, Newberg, Banks, or Clark County) or the Metro UGB is influenced by a number of factors, including:

- Governance availability
- Market conditions
- Land availability
- Infrastructure funding
- Residential preferences
- Tolerances for commute distance and time

From a market perspective, housing in UGB expansion areas and housing in neighbor cities (outside of the Metro region) are close substitutes. Though the region has ample growth capacity in urban centers, policy makers may wish to consider whether that growth capacity provides adequate housing choices to minimize spillover growth into neighbor cities. It could be argued that residential growth in a Metro region UGB expansion area is preferable to growth in a neighboring city UGB expansion area. This is because many of these residents are likely to have jobs in the Metro region. While commuters from neighboring cities represent a small share of the region’s commuters, their longer trips have implications for the region’s transportation facilities and climate goals.

To conduct its analyses of regional growth capacity, Metro determines a UGB capture rate – the amount of seven-county growth that is expected to be accommodated inside the Metro UGB. In past analyses, Metro based its analysis of needs on historic capture rates. For example, a 62% capture rate was assumed in the 2009 UGR. For the 2014 UGR, Metro shifted to using a forecast capture rate based on model results (approximately 72% capture). Staff believes that the capture rate may deserve additional discussion as it is not purely a technical matter, but also has policy implications.

To ground this discussion in practical and feasible options, staff recommends considering nominally higher capture rates only if they are backed up by concrete city plans (per previous discussions of expectations for cities requesting UGB expansions).

Staff believes that growth management decisions based on nominal changes to capture rates can be made under existing legal authority during the standard six-year urban growth management cycle. As always, however, growth management decisions may be litigated. This approach emphasizes the need for cities requesting UGB expansions to demonstrate that the expansion areas will produce in housing in less than 20 years (i.e., that the assumed capture rate will be backed up by housing production).

Possible UGB adjustment mechanisms that would require changes to state law

State law instructs Metro in how to determine whether there is a regional need for UGB expansions. The Metro Council has indicated that it wants to maintain the principle of only expanding the UGB when there is a need. In that context, policy makers may wish to suggest legislative concepts that expand the definition of need in state law. For example, policy makers may wish to consider the following concepts that would require changes to state law:

- A UGB expansion is needed if it would make infrastructure provision more efficient for areas already inside the UGB.
- Under a UGB exchange process, allow incremental additions to be made to compensate for a previous, larger removal of UGB lands.

Needs based on infrastructure efficiency

Policy makers may wish to seek changes to state law to add another type of land need – that a UGB expansion is needed when adding the area will facilitate the efficient provision of infrastructure to areas already inside the UGB. While this may apply in some situations, staff's sense is that this concept would not address the bulk of UGB expansions of interest to cities.

UGB exchange land banking

Under existing state law, lands inside the UGB can be exchanged for comparable amounts of buildable land in urban reserves. Under current law, this exchange must be simultaneous, which could lead to a piecemeal approach to removing areas from the UGB, introducing uncertainty for property owners and local jurisdictions as well as the potential for bureaucratic delays.

Policy makers may wish to seek changes to state law that would allow Metro to remove a larger area from the UGB in one action, treating it as a land bank that can be redeemed over time with modest UGB expansions as cities make a compelling case to the region for the expansions.



Date: July 14, 2016
To: Urban Growth Management Readiness Task Force
Cc: Metro Council
From: Roger Alfred, Legal Counsel
Ted Reid, Principal Regional Planner
John Williams, Deputy Director for Planning and Development
Re: Options for task force consideration

Task force direction to staff to date

At its June 22, 2016 meeting, the Urban Growth Readiness Task Force agreed on a framework that describes a problem statement, core values and guiding principles. The group began a discussion of possible solutions and requested that staff work with MTAC to develop a summary of possible options and considerations for moving forward.

The task force asked for staff suggestions in two general categories:

- Defining expectations for cities requesting modest urban growth boundary (UGB) expansions.
- Identifying additional mechanisms for adjusting the UGB.

The task force and other stakeholders have also raised the topic of how “modest” UGB expansions might be defined. This memo makes an initial recommendation regarding the scale and frequency of UGB expansions.

MTAC discussed these topics on July 13 and its discussion is reflected in this memo. As outlined here, much of what has been discussed by the task force can be done under existing state law, but would require amending Metro’s Urban Growth Management Functional Plan.

Suggested definition for “modest” UGB expansions

So that expectations, concerns, and solutions are right-sized, staff suggests that the task force make a recommendation regarding the potential scope and frequency of UGB expansions.

MTAC discussion:

- MTAC members presented two views on whether acreage limits are needed and how flexible they should be:
 - Be cautious setting arbitrary acreage limits that may complicate the efficient provision of infrastructure and services in concept plan areas as well as achieving economies of scale for housing construction.

- There is a need for acreage limitations for this process to ensure that it remains true to its purpose.
- Define an annual acreage limit by dividing the number of acres of urban reserves by the number of years they are intended to last.
- The cumulative effect of several “modest” UGB expansions may preclude a finding of a regional need for larger expansions – potentially also desired by cities – under the standard six-year cycle.
- After initial interest in using this system, there may be years when no cities request expansions. If no expansions are made in a given year, it may make sense to allow that acreage “credit” to accumulate or consider something other than one-year acreage limits to allow greater flexibility (e.g., consider three-year or six-year acreage limits).
- Consider the implications of setting limits on “gross” vs. “net buildable” acres. Note – the administrative rules governing UGB exchanges refer to buildable acres.
- It may be useful for Metro, counties and cities to come to some understanding of the potential sequencing of UGB expansions into urban reserves.

Staff recommendations:

Based on UGB expansion proposals currently being contemplated by cities, a maximum of 300 to 400 gross acres per year might be an appropriate size limit for expansions. This would allow urban reserves to last through the year 2060.¹ This would be consistent with the task force’s agreed upon core value that acknowledged urban reserves will represent the maximum anticipated urban footprint for the region through the year 2060. Staff recommends additional discussion of several concepts:

- The appropriate acreage limit for UGB expansions.
- Allowing acreage “credit” to accumulate in years when no expansions are made.
- Coordinating and periodically revisiting a non-binding, conceptual sequence of potential future UGB expansions into urban reserves.

Suggested factors to guide decisions on whether to add an urban reserve to the UGB

The task force wishes to identify factors related to community readiness that could be considered in UGB decisions. Based on task force direction to date, staff suggests that those factors be thought of in two general categories:

1. Produce housing in less than 20 years
2. Advance regional and local desired outcomes

Since weighing these factors will necessarily entail that policy makers make judgment calls, staff does not recommend being overly prescriptive with criteria and metrics. Staff also suggests that most of the focus be on factors in the first category (demonstrating that the expansion area would produce housing in 20 years or sooner), rather than the more subjective second category (demonstrating that the UGB adjustment would advance regional and local desired outcomes).

¹ If urban reserves are acknowledged as currently mapped, they consist of approximately 22,600 gross acres.

1. Produce a variety of housing in less than 20 years

The urban growth management process improvements under discussion are intended to facilitate housing construction. Task force members have reiterated the goals of state, regional and local policies that emphasize the importance of providing housing choices, including affordable housing. Among other requirements, Title 11 (Planning for New Urban Areas) of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan currently instructs cities address the following in concept plans for urban reserves:

- Consider how to provide a range of housing types, tenures (rent vs. own) and prices in concept plan areas.
- Demonstrate that they have sorted out governance and infrastructure finance questions in concept plans.

MTAC discussion:

MTAC members were largely in agreement on the following points:

- Existing requirements in Title 11 are adequate for guiding the development of concept plans. Cities do need greater certainty, however, that investments of time and money in concept plans are likely to result in UGB expansions.
- There is no need for adding additional requirements for demonstrating strong local housing market conditions since the analysis will never be conclusive and it is likely that there will be housing demand in almost all urban reserve areas if governance and infrastructure are provided.
- A holistic approach makes sense – cities should demonstrate that they are meeting baseline requirements in their existing city boundaries (not just in concept plan areas). MTAC members suggested considering amendments to the Functional Plan that place the following requirements on cities requesting UGB expansions:
 - A city should have an acknowledged housing needs analysis per Statewide Planning Goal 10 (Housing) that is coordinated with Metro's most recent forecast.
 - A city should demonstrate that it is in compliance with the state's Metropolitan Housing Rule regarding densities and the mix of housing.
 - A city should take the actions described in Title 6 of the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan (Centers, Corridors, Station Communities, and Main Streets) that are currently required for eligibility for "regional investments."
 - A city should demonstrate that it has implemented best practices such as those documented in Metro's Equitable Housing Initiative.

Staff recommendations:

- Staff does not suggest additional requirements for concept plan areas since the current Title 11 language on these topics is relatively new, untested, and addresses the topic areas mentioned by task force members.
- Staff suggests that policy makers consider amending the Functional Plan to require that cities requesting a UGB expansion demonstrate that they are proactively taking actions to encourage housing choices in existing urban areas. Additions to Metro's Functional Plan could be fleshed out with MTAC's assistance.

2. Advance regional and local desired outcomes

At its first two meetings, task force members provided input on the outcomes that they wish to achieve through urban growth management process improvements. Staff's assessment of possible options is organized around the common themes that were expressed.

Advance the region's six desired outcomes

The task force indicated that the six desired outcomes should be used as guidance when the Metro Council considers UGB expansion requests. The Regional Framework Plan states that it is the policy of the Metro Council to exercise its powers to achieve the following six outcomes, characteristics of a successful region:

1. People live, work and play in vibrant communities where their everyday needs are easily accessible.
2. Current and future residents benefit from the region's sustained economic competitiveness and prosperity.
3. People have safe and reliable transportation choices that enhance their quality of life.
4. The region is a leader in minimizing contributions to global warming.
5. Current and future generations enjoy clean air, clean water and healthy ecosystems.
6. The benefits and burdens of growth and change are distributed equitably.

MTAC discussion:

MTAC members did not discuss this topic much, but seemed to concur with Metro staff's recommendation to allow flexibility in how cities would address this factor.

Staff recommendations:

To implement task force direction, the Functional Plan could be amended to require that cities requesting UGB expansions describe how the actions that they are taking inside their existing urban area as well as in the proposed expansion area would advance the six desired outcomes. Because conditions around the region vary, staff recommends not being overly prescriptive in describing how cities should address these desired outcomes.

Reduce travel distances and carbon emissions

Task force members have expressed a desire to reduce workers' commute distances and carbon emissions. The suggested strategy was to add land to the UGB to create an improved local balance of housing and jobs. While this may be appealing in concept, solutions are complex in a regional economy. This is because people make multifaceted decisions about where to live and work, factoring in considerations such as school quality, work locations for all workers in the household, salary requirements, housing preferences, community characteristics, housing costs, and commute options. All cities in the region, even those with a numerical jobs/housing balance, have large numbers of residents commuting to and from other parts of the region. Additionally, most daily trips are actually non-commute trips such as running errands or taking kids to school.

MTAC discussion:

- MTAC members are skeptical of the notion of jobs/housing balance as a way to influence commute behavior, but hedged this sentiment with the statement that people should have choices of where to live.

- MTAC members suggested that the focus on creating a transit-supportive mix of uses should occur in existing urban areas since UGB expansions will typically be difficult to serve with transit.
- MTAC members suggested favoring UGB expansion requests that are closer to existing centers or that propose creating a new center.

Staff recommendations:

Creating a transit-supportive mix of uses is the most promising way to reduce non-commute travel distances and carbon emissions. This is best achieved in existing urban locations. Title 6 (Centers, Corridors, Station Communities, and Main Streets) of Metro's Functional Plan currently lists voluntary steps that cities can take to become eligible for regional investments. The Functional Plan could be amended to also state that these same steps make a city eligible for UGB expansions.

Effects on areas already inside the UGB

Task force members have described wanting to avoid UGB adjustments that come at the expense of existing urban areas. Under current Metro code, potential UGB expansion areas are considered according to a number of factors, including whether the area would contribute to the purpose of centers and corridors. In practice, it has proven difficult to make substantive statements about whether UGB expansions would contribute to the purpose of centers. Related, staff believes that it would be difficult to conclude that modest UGB expansions in one part of the region would have a detrimental effect on other parts of the region.

MTAC discussion:

MTAC members did not discuss this topic.

Staff recommendation:

Staff suggests that this concern be addressed through limitations on the size and frequency of potential UGB expansions allowable under the proposed system.

Possible mechanisms for adjusting the UGB

The task force described the challenges of past UGB expansions that were made by Metro based on estimates of regional need. These expansions often lacked local community support and the community support that did exist has often dissipated with the passage of time. Task force members described the need for future UGB expansions to be based on city requests, but to be considered in a regional context. The group identified the need for timely action to bring planned urban reserve areas into the UGB once a compelling case has been made for their inclusion.

Task force members requested that staff provide a description of options for UGB exchanges – removing non-productive areas from the UGB and compensating by adding a similar amount of buildable land by expanding the UGB elsewhere into acknowledged urban reserves. Staff suggests implementing an exchange process as a means of testing the planning requirements described above and understanding whether and what other mechanisms are needed in the longer term.

UGB exchanges

Some areas added to the UGB in the past have not yet produced housing. Typically, this has been because of annexation challenges, lack of community support, disagreement on a comprehensive plan, uncertainty about governance responsibilities, lack of funding for infrastructure, or weak market conditions. The area that was until recently the City of Damascus provides one example. While areas of

western Damascus (now disincorporated) may annex to Happy Valley and develop, there is a widely shared view that eastern Damascus will not develop to urban densities for decades to come, if ever.

Legal framework

Existing Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) rules allow local governments, including Metro, to exchange land inside the UGB for land outside the UGB “to better achieve the purposes of Goal 14.” OAR 660-024-0070(1). Goal 14 is the statewide planning goal concerning urban growth boundaries. The rules allow such exchanges to occur without undertaking a new analysis of land need, so long as the amount of buildable land being added to the UGB is substantially equivalent to the amount of buildable land being removed. The rules also provide that the normal rules governing the location of land to be added to the UGB still must be applied to land being considered for an exchange, including the requirement that acknowledged urban reserves are the first priority of land that should be included in the UGB.

Existing Metro code allows “minor adjustments” to the UGB in the form of trades of land inside the UGB for land outside the UGB; however, those rules are fairly cursory and are more restrictive than the DLCD rules in that they only allow for “small changes” to the UGB. If the task force determines that a more extensive exchange program would provide an effective solution, the Metro rules would likely need to be amended to implement such a program. However, no changes to state law would be necessary.

Opportunities:

- Can be accomplished under existing state law and administrative rules.
- Can be accomplished without a new housing needs analysis, forecast, or buildable land inventory.
- Provides a practical solution for addressing non-productive past UGB expansions.
- Provides a practical short-to-medium-term solution for accommodating city requests for UGB expansions into urban reserves.

Challenges:

- Removing land from the UGB could be contentious or create uncertainty for some land owners.
- The region would need to determine whether areas removed from the UGB become urban reserves or undesignated and, if undesignated, avoid creating urban reserve “islands” that are not adjacent to the UGB.
- Removing land from the UGB in one part of the region and replacing it in another part of the region could raise geographic equity concerns.
- The region only has acknowledged urban reserves in Washington County. Urban reserves receive first priority for UGB expansions.
- Exchanges may not provide a long-term solution to the task force’s identified problem statement (eventually may run out of lands to exchange out of the UGB).
- Statewide Planning Goal 14 (Urbanization) factors still apply when deciding which urban reserve to bring into the UGB. That analysis may not always prioritize the urban reserves that cities are requesting for expansion.

MTAC discussion:

- MTAC members had mixed views on whether the region should pursue the UGB exchange concept. Some members feel that the exchange process will be too complicated and believe there is a need to seek changes to state law instead. Others pointed out that changing state law, Statewide Planning Goals, and administrative rules is also complicated and subject to an unpredictable political process.
- Some members wondered whether taking areas out of the UGB would result in Measure 49² claims. Metro and state legal counsel believe that UGB exchanges would not produce valid Measure 49 claims since Measure 49 refers to changes in zoning that reduce value. No changes in zoning are contemplated for areas that could be taken out of the UGB.
- An MTAC member suggested that if the region is not willing to pursue the exchange process, we need to close the discussion on how to account for growth capacity in the Damascus area in future urban growth reports.
- An MTAC member indicated that taking away land in one part of the region to add land elsewhere will be politically challenging.
- An MTAC member suggested that the region needs a holistic approach to addressing the land that was until recently the eastern part of the City of Damascus.

Staff recommendations:

While staff agrees with MTAC's assessment that the UGB exchange process will be challenging to execute, staff believes that amending state laws would be more difficult. Furthermore, the task force has indicated its desire to consider an exchange process. If the Council and task force wish to advance the UGB exchange concept further, staff suggests the following additional considerations:

- The task force may wish to suggest changes to state laws to facilitate the UGB exchange process. For instance, it may be advantageous to remove larger areas from the UGB all at once, rather than piecemeal, and treat these as credits to be redeemed, rather than periodically removing smaller areas.
- The task force may wish to recommend a broader public engagement process to involve those who may be interested in or impacted by UGB exchanges.
- It is possible that sorting out the details of an exchange process involving the land formerly in Damascus would not be completed in time for the 2018 Metro urban growth management decision.
- The task force may wish to recommend placing limits on the amount of land in one county that can be exchanged for land in another county.

For future discussion

This memo is a first attempt at fleshing out the concepts suggested by the task force. Staff suggests that policy makers consider testing out these concept planning requirements by using the UGB exchange process for modest UGB expansions. Doing so could provide a useful framework for considering whether

² In 2007, Oregon voters passed Measure 49, which lays out property owners' recourse if their residentially zoned land is rezoned and that action results in a decrease in fair market value.

other mechanisms for addressing UGB expansion requests are warranted in the long term, how they could function, and whether they can be achieved under the existing legal framework.



DATE: July 22, 2016
TO: TPAC, MTAC and Interested Parties
FROM: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager
SUBJECT: 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Update – Technical Work Group Meetings

PURPOSE

Provide electronic copies of meeting notes from technical work group meetings. No action requested.

BACKGROUND

At the January meeting, members of the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) requested meeting notes from work group meetings be provided to TPAC and the Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) to help TPAC and MTAC members stay informed of the work group discussions and progress.

The current schedule of work group meetings and copies of meeting notes completed since May 20 are attached.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

All work group meeting materials and other project related information are posted online at: www.oregonmetro.gov/rtp.

Attachments

- Schedule of technical work group meetings *(July 19, 2016)*
- Regional Transit Technical Work Group Meeting #3 *(June 9, 2016)*
- Regional Transit Technical Work Group Special Work Session *(July 11, 2016)*
- Finance Work Group Meeting #3 *(June 14, 2016)*
- Transportation Equity Technical Work Group Meeting #4 *(June 30, 2016)*
- Performance Technical Work Group Meeting #3 *(June 27, 2016)*

2018 RTP UPDATE | Technical Work Group Meetings

2016	Equity	Finance	Transit	Freight	Performance	Safety	Design
January	Jan. 8 9-11 a.m. Room 401, MRC		Jan. 7 10 a.m.-noon Room 401, MRC	Jan. 20 8-9:30 a.m. Room 370, MRC			
February	Feb. 18 1-3 p.m. Room 401, MRC	Feb. 29 2:30-4:30 p.m., Room 501, MRC	Feb. 24 1 - 3 p.m., Room 401, MRC		Feb. 22 2-4 p.m. Room 501, MRC		
March							
April					April 25 2-4 p.m. Room 501, MRC		
May	May 12 1-3 p.m. Room 401, MRC	May 12 9-11 a.m., Council Chamber, MRC		May 23 10 a.m.-noon, Council chamber		May 20 9 a.m.-noon Room 270, MRC	
June	June 30 1-3 p.m., Council chamber, MRC	June 14 9-11 a.m., Room 401, MRC	June 9 1-3 p.m., Room 370A/B, MRC		June 27 2-4 p.m. Room 401, MRC		
July			July 19 9-11 a.m., Room 370A/B, MRC			July 26 8:30-10:30 a.m., Room 401, MRC	
August		Aug. 4 9-11 a.m., Room 501, MRC	Aug. 10 1-3 p.m., Room 370A/B, MRC				
September	Sept. 15 1-3 p.m. Room 401, MRC		Sept. 13 2-4 p.m., Room 370A/B, MRC	Sept. 27 8-10 a.m., Council chamber, MRC	Sept. 12 2-4 p.m. Room 401, MRC		
October			Oct. 5 1-3 p.m., Room 370A/B, MRC		Oct. 14 10 a.m.-noon Room 401, MRC	Oct. 20 9-11 a.m. Room 501, MRC	
November	Nov. 17 1-3 p.m. Room 401, MRC		Nov. 2 1-3 p.m., Room 370A/B, MRC				Nov. 15 9 a.m.-noon Room 401, MRC
December			Dec. 7 1-3 p.m., Room 370A/B, MRC				

Meetings of the Policy Actions Work Group begin in 2017. Meeting materials will be posted at oregonmetro.gov/rtp and oregonmetro.gov/calendar



Regional Transit Work Group Meeting #3
Thursday, June 9, 2016
1:00 to 3:00 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Room 370

Committee Members Present

April Bertelsen	City of Portland
Dan Bower	Portland Streetcar Inc
Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
Brad Choi	City of Hillsboro
Teresa Christopherson	Clackamas County
Mike Coleman	Port of Portland
Karyn Criswell	Oregon Department of Transportation
Radcliffe Dacanay	City of Portland
Steve Dickey	Salem-Keizer Transit
Denny Egner	City of Milwaukie
Roger Hanson	C-TRAN
Eric Hesse	TriMet
Job Holan	City of Forest Grove
Katherine Kelly	City of Gresham
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Wilsonville
Stephan Lashbrook	City of Wilsonville/SMART
Mauricio LeClerc	City of Portland
Steve Nakana	Port of Portland
Luke Norman	Clackamas County Community College
Alex Page	Ride Connection
Luke Pelz	City of Beaverton
Cynthia Thompson	BCB Consulting
Dyami Valentine	Washington County
Dayna Webb	City of Oregon City
Julie Wehling	Canby Area Transit

Metro Staff Present

Grace Cho
Kim Ellis
Lake McTighe
John Mermin
Chris Meyers
Jamie Snook

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Members of the work group introduced themselves, described who they were talking to about the transit Strategy and answered the ice breaker question.

II. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) UPDATE

Kim Ellis provided a briefing on the April 22 Regional Leadership Forum. She urged the work group to review the complete report from the forum, which provides detailed take-aways. She noted that there was worry among leadership that we are making the wrong investments, that uncertainty was a prevailing sentiment at the forum, and that elected, community and business leaders will need support moving big ideas forward. One work group member noted that the discussions at the forum were not as outcome driven as they could have been. Kim noted that the work group needs to connect back to leadership.

There will be two more forums this year, September 23rd and December 2nd, that will focus on funding and the regional vision to define the updated RTP project list. At the October 2017 forum, there will be a report back on the technical evaluation of the updated project list. A final forum in June 2018 will be to reach final agreement on the project list and plan.

III. RTP PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Jamie Snook provided an overview of the 2014 RTP targets, performance and system measures, highlighting those directly related to transit. She asked the work group to consider whether transit productivity and access to daily needs the right measures to focus on in the RTP. There can be more measures considered in the overall Regional Transit Strategy. Work group questions and comments:

- It's important to understand what is meant by affordability and what is really being measured.
- The number of households and jobs drives the productivity of transit and should be part of the measures.
- Just capturing the system wide does not adequately capture all elements of the system. Single region wide numbers do not tell you enough. Good for seeing trends.
- Missing measure: what are the barriers to increasing transit use (marketing, technology, popularity of transit, competing with Uber, etc).
- Need to understand the impact of car sharing and other services that compete with transit.
- Need accessibility measure.
- Transit mode share is an important measure.
- Need to simplify and reduce measures in RTP and focus on measures the provide information on big regional outcomes. The Regional Transit Strategy can include additional measures.
- Reliability should be a measure.
- We should measure access to different destinations (where the people, where do they want to go) and what are the barriers.
- Look at the TriMet Equity Index for essential destinations.

Grace Cho provided a brief overview of the equity work group’s draft performance measures, which include several measures related to transit. The work group is interested in measuring the equity impacts of transit costs (to the rider), access to transit and provided by, and transit reliability.

- The C-TRAN member asked if anyone from Clark County was on the equity work group. Grace responded no, but they are welcome to attend and can easily be added to the group.
- The transit work group expressed interest in better understanding of the safety exposure measure.
- Would be helpful to measure transit access compared to transit travel time and auto travel time.
- To measure accessibility, look at what destinations are accessible within a certain time.

IV. REGIONAL TRANSIT VISION

There was not time for a full discussion of this agenda item. Jamie reminded the work group of the draft vision is to make transit more frequent, convenient, accessible and affordable.

V. PARTNER UPDATES

There was not time to provide additional partner updates by TriMet, Portland Streetcar and SMART.

VI. NEXT STEPS

Jamie reviewed the next steps quickly, then adjourned the meeting.

VI. ADJOURN

The meeting at was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description
1	Agenda	6/9/16	June 9, 2016 Meeting Agenda
2	Meeting summary	2/24/16	February Regional Transit Work Group meeting Summary
3	RTP Update	5/20/16	RTP Regional Leadership Forum #1 Summary
4	RTP Web link	5/25/16	RTP Regional Leadership Forum #1 Report
5	RTP Performance Measures	4/15/16	RTP Performance Measure Scoping Report



Regional Transit Work Group Meeting #3
Monday, July 11, 2016
2:30 to 4:30 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Room 370

Committee Members Present

Dan Bower	Portland Streetcar Inc
Brad Choi	City of Hillsboro
Chris Deffebach	Washington County
Eric Hesse	TriMet
Andi Howell	City of Sandy
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Wilsonville
Stephan Lashbrook	City of Wilsonville/SMART
Mauricio LeClerc	City of Portland
Alex Page	Ride Connection
Dayna Webb	City of Oregon City
Steve White	Oregon Public Health Institute
Julie Wehling	Canby Area Transit

Metro Staff Present

Clint Chiavarini
Grace Cho
John Mermin
Chris Meyers
Thaya Patton
Jamie Snook

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Members of the work group introduced themselves and answered the ice breaker question.

II. REGIONAL TRANSIT STRATEGY VISION

Ms. Snook reminded the group of the overview of the transit strategy vision statement: to make transit more frequent, convenient, accessible and affordable.

III. RTP PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Ms. Snook provided a quick overview of what performance measures are currently in the 2014 RTP and additional measures recommended through the Climate Smart Strategy.

IV. HCT PLAN EVALUATION CRITERIA/MEASURES

Ms. Snook provided a quick overview of the evaluation criteria or performance measures that were used in the development of the 2009 HCT System Plan.

V. DISCUSSION

Ms. Snook concluded the overview and opened up the meeting for discussion. What measures will best tell the story?

Performance measure vs screening criteria:

- The performance measures are to measure the entire system and not screen out projects. Criteria for prioritizing projects will be identified through the Transit System Expansion Policy phase. We have hired a consultant, through an ODOT TGM grant, to support this effort and we will be discussing at a future date.

Telling the story:

- The numbers by themselves don't mean as much, we need to be able to tell a compelling story. Some of the measures don't tell a story by themselves. We should create a simple story that is more for general consumption.
- The fewer performance measures the better. Some of the others are more storied.
- A lot work went into the Climate Smart Strategy and we shouldn't come up with new measures just for the sake of new measures. We have most of this information already.
- It was suggested to split the measures into different buckets: network access, operations and customer service.
- We should be able to pull out pieces of the performance measures, see what they tell us and collapse to remove redundancy.
- There is a desire to see how do these measures align with the goals of the RTP and how the proposed investments help achieve these goals.
- There was discussion regarding coordination between the equity and transit work groups.

Metro Model:

- Metro's model is now 24 hours, which may make some of the analysis easier.
- Some things can't be modeled. The first/last mile is particularly important. There may things we want to do on a policy level that we can't model very well.

Specific measures:

- We should have a region wide mode share measure as well as one that includes the 2040 mixed use areas.
- Time based access and daily needs, who has access, how long take to get there... those are important measures to include.
- Mode share important to highlight a balanced system.
- There was a question about what is frequent service: currently frequent service is 15 minutes or better. What is expected in 2040? Smaller providers will never get to frequent service by 2040. So for us it's more about getting people out of their cars and making the connections they need.
- These measures are silent on the demand response portion of our transit system.
- Additionally, the ¼ mile capture area as part of the measures skews towards the urbanized areas. In rural and suburban areas, there may not even be a major road within ¼ mile.
- There is a desire to look at greenhouse gas emissions for transit, for example: electric buses versus diesel powered and how the change in fleet impacts air quality.
- We will develop transit scenarios in which we can compare current and future.
- Basic accessibility needs to be addressed in the performance measure.
- We should include accessibility and park and rides in how we measure the performance.
- There should be a land use measure: As a region, we should make sure we are building housing, TOD, senior housing on transit lines and the land uses and transit support each other.
- Tie the performance measures to the vision statement and the three categories: access, operations and customer service.
- Revenue service hours and productivity are already being tracked.
- There was concern that the economic development is not a part of the measures. There is interest in identifying where that measure best fits, the RTS or eventually through corridor planning and project development.
- There was discussion about modeling versus monitoring, for example, reliability is something that can be monitored easier than it can be modeled.

Ms. Snook committed to bringing a summary of this discussion and draft direction on the performance measures to consider to the Transit Work Group on July 19th.

VI. NEXT STEPS

Ms. Snook reviewed the next steps with the group:

- Recommend performance measures to consider regarding transit
- Discuss the Regional Transit Vision
- Prepare for the Regional Leadership #2

VI. ADJOURN

The meeting at was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Attachments to the Record:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description
1	Agenda	6/9/16	June 9, 2016 Meeting Agenda
2	Meeting summary	2/24/16	February Regional Transit Work Group meeting Summary



**2018 RTP Finance Work Group - Meeting #3
June 14, 2016
9 - 11 AM
Metro Regional Center, 401**

Work Group Members Present

Name	Affiliation
Tina Bailey	City of Hillsboro
Rich Blackburn	City of Forest Grove
Chris Deffebach	Washington County
Eric Hesse	TriMet
Ken Lee	City of Portland
Mark Lear	City of Portland
Ted Leybold	Metro
Ken Lobeck	Metro
John Lewis	City of Oregon City
John Lewis	City of Oregon City
Jaimie Lorenzini	City of Happy Valley
Steve Kelley	Washington County
Nancy Kraushaar	City of Wilsonville
Lake McTighe	Metro
Jamie Snook	Metro
Joanna Valencia	Multnomah County

Metro Staff Present: Ted Leybold, Ken Lobeck, Jamie Snook, Lake McTighe and Kim Ellis.

I. WELCOME

Ted Leybold welcomed members to the third meeting of the RTP Finance Work Group.

II. PARTNER UPDATES

- Jamie Lorenzini, City of Happy Valley, identified that the city of Happy Valley is examining a transportation maintenance fee based on several factors. She indicated the discussion currently is very preliminary and is really more in the feasibility stage.
- Jamie also identified that Clackamas County Commission may seek an eight cent gas tax in the fall, but the item has not been referred. Again, the discussion is more in

the feasibility stage. The advisory vote on the May ballot received 65% support. It was included on a Transportation summit recently that provided an opportunity for cities to describe their preferences including a VRF or gas tax. The County has identified the revenue stream in support of maintenance needs. Discussions among the cities for the possible measure will continue.

- Richard Blackmum, city of Forest Grove identified that the city Council will also be looking at road maintenance fee. People now recognize the impact of not having sufficient funding to maintain the system. Discussions are beginning.
- Ken Lee, city of Portland provided an update to their recently passed city gas tax. The city of Portland is working through the administration requirements of the new gas tax and demonstrating value to community. The business and truck fee details are still being worked out.

III. UPDATE ON IDENTIFICATION OF EXISTING LOCAL REVENUES

Ken Lobeck provided an update on the local revenue templates in development:

- Work continues but development of the templates has been delayed due to ongoing MTIP/STIP project delivery issues that are taking priority over the RTP revenue templates.
- Washington County's templates are nearly complete. Ken will continue working with Multnomah and Clackamas counties into July.
- The goal is to finish all revenue templates by the end of July.
- The TSPs and budget summaries are being used as the source for the local revenues, but many of the TSPs have revenue assumption shortcomings. As a result, Ken encouraged staff to review the template revenues closely for logic and accuracy.

IV. RTP OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE REVENUES AND COSTS

Ken Lobeck and Ted Leybold provided an update to the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) exercise also underway:

- Based feedback from the May RTP Finance Group meeting, Metro developed a summary worksheet to capture O&M costs to balance against the O&M revenues being identified on the local revenue templates.
- Ken reviewed the O&M cost worksheet with group members.
- The primary goal is to capture at a summary high level if the identified annual O&M revenues are sufficient to meet the transportation maintenance requirements, or if a maintenance gap exists.
- The second goal is to identify again only at a high summary level how agencies address the maintenance gap, and/or utilize deferred maintenance practices.
- Ted Leybold clarified that this intended to get at a view of the entire regional transportation network because it impacts the ability to invest in local and regional system capital needs. This information will help explain the depth of the

- deferred maintenance issue, and help policy makers better understand the associated opportunity costs when considering new funding commitments to capital or maintenance needs.
- Discussion then focused on specific O&M cost areas to ensure members understand how to complete the worksheet. Topic areas included:
 - The impact of Washington County's projected maintenance gap being on the collectors and arterials.
 - How to have a complete O&M cost picture at a high level for Fall Regional Leadership Forums when agencies may be defining their maintenance programs differently.
 - How the County Coordinating Committees can help collect the O&M costs data.
 - Defining if storm water maintenance should be included as a transportation O&M category.
 - Discussing if street light replacement to LEDs and other maintenance areas are maintenance or capital areas, and how to define the line between the two.
 - Discussing ADA guidelines, plus how this adds another serious wrinkle to the maintenance costs issue, and how ADA areas should be treated.
 - Considering for the Fall Regional Leadership Forums how to share agency maintenance program information.
 - Addressing a request to provide additional guidance on how deferred maintenance is defined, plus what is defined as an adequate level of maintenance. The definitions may vary across jurisdictions. Ted clarified that Metro is looking for a brief summary description of how each jurisdiction defines their deferred maintenance program. Providing extensive details are not required.
 - Washington County group members mentioned that they are updating their ADA plan now. One key finding emerging is the cost of the upgrades for ADA compliance. Others agreed that this should be highlighted as a significant need. Discussion continued as to whether ADA compliance projects are maintenance or capital improvements. Clarification is needed here.
 - Bridge replacements are another big cost and O&M topic area discussed. Ted Leybold confirmed that that ongoing annual maintenance to bridges fit into the O&M logic. However, bridge replacements even if not providing capacity improvements are considered capital improvements rather than O&M.
 - Due to the mixed opinions expressed as to what defines O&M costs, the group requested Metro research several areas and provide additional clarification on the final worksheet that will be released.

V. UPDATE ON REGIONAL LEADERSHIP FORUMS AND NEXT STEPS:

- Kim Ellis provided an overview of the key takeaways of the first Regional Leadership Forum and the proposed schedule for the Fall Leadership Workshops.
- There were six primary takeaways Kim passed on to the group that included:
 - Our region is growing and changing and so is the world around us.
 - The region’s transportation system is a shared experience and a shared responsibility.
 - We need to define a bold vision for the future of transportation and the role it should play in our communities.
 - Our transportation system must be inclusive and benefit all families, communities, and economy.
 - Technology and data will be transformational and are key to a bold vision.
 - We need partnerships and leadership to create a great future.

VI. NEXT STEPS:

- Several members expressed concerns about the use of the revenue data at the Fall Leadership Forums. Ken reassured group members they would receive the draft revenue forecast for review prior to the Fall Leadership Workshops. He also cautioned that the initial revenue forecast will be extremely “soft” as many of the identified revenues will require follow-on review and possible adjustments. Once drafted, the financially constrained revenue forecast will be a living document undergoing constant minor updating until formal approval occurs.
- The next meeting will be Aug. 4. A meeting appointment will be sent out to group members.
- With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:40 pm.

Approved as written,

Ken Lobeck
Funding Programs Lead, Metro



2018 RTP Transportation Equity Work Group – Meeting #4
Thursday, June 30, 2016
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.
Metro Regional Center, Council Chambers

Committee Members	Affiliation	Attendance
Jessica Berry	Multnomah County	Present
Stephanie Caldera	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality	Present
Brad Choi	City of Hillsboro	Present
Courtney Duke	City of Portland – Transportation	Present
Aaron Golub	Portland State University	Present
Scotty Ellis	Metro	Present
Eric Hesse	TriMet	Present
Cora Potter	Ride Connection	Present
Steve Williams	Clackamas County	Present
Kari Schlosshauer	Oregon Walks/National Safe Routes to School Partnership	Present
Karen Savage	Washington County	Present
Steven Nakana	Port of Portland	Present
Kay Durtschi	Citizen Member of MTAC	Present
Terra Lingley	ODOT	Present
Nicole Phillips	Bus Riders Unite	Present
Interested Parties		
Katie Selin	Portland State University	Present
Bradley Buselli	Portland State University	Present
Metro Staff		
Grace Cho	Metro	Present
Lake McTighe	Metro	Present
Cliff Higgins	Metro	Present
Jamie Snook	Metro	Present
John Mermin	Metro	Present
Peggy Morell	Metro	Present
Cindy Pederson	Metro	Present

I. WELCOME AND STAFF UPDATES

Cliff Higgins welcomed meeting attendees and walked through the agenda for the work group meeting. He also gave a brief staff update on the progress of the spring engagement activities and stated a summary report on the spring engagement will be available by the September work group meeting.

II. INTRODUCTIONS AND PARTNER UPDATES

In efforts to provide enough time for discussion on the third item in the agenda, Mr. Higgins asked any new work group members to introduce themselves. Mr. Steven Nakana, from the Port of Portland, introduced himself and provided a brief background on his work as the equity officer at the Port. Following introductions of new members, Mr. Higgins asked if any members had any updates or communication to the work group.

III. 2018 RTP DRAFT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY SYSTEM EVALUATION MEASURES RESEARCH AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. Cho reminded members at the May work group meeting, the work group gave the “green light” for staff to move into a research phase to identify how the priority areas identified by historically underrepresented communities could be measured in a system-wide transportation evaluation. She then explained the focus of this June work group meeting is to discuss the results of the research phase and the staff recommendations for the 2018 RTP transportation equity system evaluation measures. Prior to beginning the presentation on the research results, she reminded the work group that the charge is to define system evaluation measures around the priority topics identified by historically underrepresented communities. She then showed a list of the priority topics which were discussed in May.

Following, Ms. Cho walked through the research process undertaken by PSU. She discussed the research work was to identify system evaluation measures which could assess the priorities identified by historically underserved communities. The PSU research efforts looked into three different areas to identify measures: 1) equity assessments undertaken by other regional agencies; 2) work published by think tank and advocacy organizations; and 3) academic literature. The PSU work identified over 120 system evaluation and monitoring measures that address the different priority topic areas identified by historically underrepresented communities. The PSU team screened 120 system evaluation and monitoring measures for those which could be used in a system evaluation of future transportation conditions, which narrowed the number of measures. Upon further review, the PSU team determined many were minor variations of approximately 20 system evaluation measures. These 20 system evaluation measures were recommended to forward to Metro staff for further consideration.

Once the PSU team had brought forward a set of recommendations to Metro staff, Ms. Cho then explained a screening process was used to determine which measures would be recommended to the work group. Metro staff used four screening questions:

- 1) Is the measure able to assess future conditions and can the measure provide information from an equity perspective in the future conditions?
- 2) Can the measure inform the 2018 RTP performance targets or system evaluation?

- 3) Does the measure align and inform other 2018 RTP focus areas?
- 4) Can the system measure be completed in the timeframe of the 2018 RTP?

Based on the screening questions applied by Metro staff, Ms. Cho said 11 evaluation measures were being recommended for the transportation equity analysis. Ms. Cho noted seven of the 11 measures are confirmed recommendations, while four recommendations remain pending at this time because they warrant further discussion with public health partners and potential partnership to conduct the analysis for the measure.

Ms. Cho also discussed several key assumptions for the overall system evaluation which are necessary in order to conduct the transportation equity analysis with the 11 recommended measures. She mentioned these are the key assumptions Metro staff has identified to date, but others may emerge staff continues to develop and apply the system evaluation measures.

At this point, Mr. Higgins paused the presentation to allow work group members to ask any questions regarding the information presented.

Mr. Hesse asked how the transportation equity analysis will consider the transportation needs of people with disabilities. Ms. Cho responded with Metro staff's struggle to with data related to people with disabilities. She said the intention is to incorporate different recommendations and considerations from TriMet's Coordinated Transportation Plan for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities into the work group recommendations.

Mr. Williams asked as to why the transportation equity analysis is considering the race and ethnicity rather than emphasizing income as the main driver for the work. He suggested the transportation needs are likely the same between people of different race and ethnicity, but of a similar income group. He also asked for data to support difference in travel patterns by race and ethnicity. He asked whether the Oregon Household Activity Survey (OHAS) indicates different travel patterns by race and ethnicity. Ms. Phillips responded to Mr. Williams question about why an income-only focused approach misses a number of the different institutional barriers which are driven by race and ethnicity. Additionally, Mr. Golub cited different research which illustrates differences in travel patterns based on race and ethnicity.

A work group member suggested the system evaluation measures take into account a person's preference for travel rather than how the person has to travel because of a lack of options. She noted that the lack of viable options can force the use of a specific travel option and while investment in that option may improve travel, it is not addressing or supporting the preferred travel option.

Ms. Phillips made a comment about one of the key assumptions for the overall system evaluation. She expressed concerns that community change is happening at a rapid pace and that even making certain static assumptions about communities for the next ten-years maybe a false assumption.

Ms. Caldera commented on her support for proposed measure #9 which is taking a more expansive look at environmental impacts.

Ms. Berry asked Metro staff to elaborate more about the underlying land use, population, and employment forecast for the system evaluation. She asked more specifically how staff gathers the data to understand where low-income populations shift or move to in the future. Ms. Cho explained as part of Metro's work related to the urban growth management decision process, Metro uses a modeling tool which takes in land use and zoning information from local jurisdictions and projects out information certain population, demographic, and employment information in a spatial context.

Another work group member commented that some of the measures seemed circular.

Mr. Williams suggested the measures which have an air quality component should focus on those air pollutants which are transportation-related and harmful to communities.

Mr. Ellis also asked for the specific reasons as to why the nine measures were not recommended to move forward. Ms. Cho responded that many of these measures might have been duplicative or were interesting system measures, but they did not make it through the screening process applied by staff. Mr. Ellis asked that staff provide a document which illustrates the justification for the nine measures which were removed from consideration. Ms. Schlosshauer concurred with Mr. Ellis' suggestion.

IV. BREAK

Mr. Higgins excused everyone for a short stretch break.

V. 2018 RTP DRAFT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY SYSTEM EVALUATION MEASURES RESEARCH AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the break, Ms. Cho continued with the presentation. She mentioned in addition to the key assumptions for the overall system evaluation, there are a number of areas in need of further resolution for each of the individual system evaluation measures. She noted some staff has identified to date.

Ms. Cho also discussed how the work to define the transportation equity system evaluation measures is intended to help shape and support discussions for the 2018 RTP performance measures and targets. She outlined the request by the performance measures work group to gather feedback on certain key performance targets and system evaluation measures. Ms. Cho mentioned several of the transportation equity system evaluation measures overlap with the performance measures work group request. She also said she would bring a proposal forward at the September work group meeting on refinements and suggestions for the performance measures.

At the end of the presentation, Ms. Cho paused to take any questions.

A work group member suggested including walking was not identified as part of the accessibility measures which are looking at destinations reachable by different modes by different timeframes.

Ms. Potter mentioned the accessibility measures should not solely focus on physical accessibility, but also temporal accessibility. She noted that while a transportation option may be available to someone during regular work hours, access may not be available at other times limiting options.

Ms. Schlosshauer suggested adding medical care facilities into the list of essential destinations for the accessibility measure. Another work group member suggested adding cultural venues and cultural destinations to the essential destinations list.

Ms. Potter commented that the job profile selected for the access to jobs measure should consider those jobs with wages that a single wage earner could support an average household.

Mr. Hesse commented that TriMet's Transit Equity Advisory Committee has been working on defining different essential destinations to access by transit. He offered to help bring that information if interested by Metro.

Ms. Durtschi commented that travel to, from, and between, non-residential areas are incredibly important and suggested this consideration be integrated into the accessibility measures.

Mr. Williams stated that in today's society it is not possible to define what a family wage job.

Another work group member commented that access will differ by community because there will be different barriers different communities face. These different barriers and considerations of access should be incorporated as to how Metro conducts the accessibility analysis for the system evaluation.

Mr. Hesse suggested that the transit access disadvantage measure be coupled with other metrics, such as demand and productivity, to help provide a full picture.

Mr. Choi commented he appreciated that the accessibility measures to jobs and essential destinations will be considering automobile travel. He noted that for people who have shift jobs, the temporal considerations of traffic congestion during peak travel times may not be as significant.

Mr. Ellis suggested reframing the recommended public health measures as all the system evaluation measures proposed are considered a part of public health.

Another work group member asked how the consideration of street design and safety would be considered as part of the transportation equity analysis system evaluation. Ms. Cho mentioned that project specific details, such as the design will vary from project-to-project, and she reiterated the work group charge. However, Ms. Cho also mentioned there will be future

opportunity through the 2018 RTP process to provide input to staff on various policy recommendations which can help influence design considerations in projects. Ms. Cho alluded to the next item on the agenda in addressing the different opportunities.

Ms. Cho mentioned that at the end of the discussion, her ask of the work group is to give Metro staff a “green light” to continue to move forward with the recommended transportation equity system evaluation measures and work through a number of the areas in need of resolution. Metro staff will report back the information at the September work group meeting.

Additionally, Ms. Cho mentioned for work group members interested digging into the details of the different measures, she is holding an informal and optional work session at the end of July to work through several of the areas in need of resolution.

Recognizing the remaining time for the agenda item is running short, Mr. Higgins took a “thumbs up or thumbs down” vote to the ask put forward by Ms. Cho regarding moving the recommended transportation equity system evaluation measures forward. Work group members voted unanimously to move the work forward.

VI. PROPOSED PRODUCTS TO RESULT FROM THE TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ANALYSIS

Ms. Cho provided a brief overview of the proposed products to come from the transportation equity analysis work. Ms. Cho noted, to date, six products have been identified. Ms. Cho walked through the timeframe of when the proposed products are likely to be developed and noted the work for these proposed products will kick off in 2017 after the assessment of the 2018 RTP investment package.

At the end of the presentation, Ms. Cho asked the work group if they had questions or comments regarding the proposed products.

Ms. Selin commented that the proposed products do not speak to broader audience aside from technical and policy works. In recognizing the transportation equity work is intended to connect community desires for the transportation system to policies, the work products should somehow connect with a community audience as well.

VII. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS/NEXT STEPS

Ms. Cho asked if there were any further questions regarding the materials presented at the work group meeting.

Ms. Schlosshauer asked how Metro staff is coordinating among the different work groups; particularly she asked how the transportation equity work group is working with the finance work group. Ms. Cho responded that the finance work group scope is fairly narrowly defined in determining the overall financial projection for the 2018 RTP. She explained the process for defining the financial projection usually entailing taking historical revenues the region has received in the past and trending those revenues at an inflation rate into the future. Mr. Hesse stepped in, as someone who has been sitting in as an alternate on the finance work group, by

saying the projection of past revenue streams has been the main focus of the finance work group, but as the discussion moves forward towards new revenue streams there is the opportunity to discuss equity considerations of those revenue streams. Ms. Cho said she'd follow up with the finance work group to get a better understanding of the work group's scope of work and report back at the following work group meeting.

Mr. Golub commented that the combined housing and transportation expenditure measure may help identify the equity issues in the financing system. He also expressed progressive revenue sources to fund the transportation system should be part of the discussions in the finance work group.

Ms. Cho walked through a preview of the material to be covered at the September work group meeting. She also confirmed the work group will be meeting in November. Lastly, Ms. Cho walked through the homework assignments for the work group. She asked between the June and September work group meeting, for members to complete the following "homework" assignments:

- Report back to your people what was discussed at the work group meeting and bring any feedback.
- Participate in the optional work session in late July.
- Lastly come prepared at the next work group meeting to make recommendations on the draft transportation equity evaluation measures for the 2018 RTP investment package.

VIII. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Ms. Cho and Mr. Higgins adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Meeting summary prepared by: Grace Cho, Transportation Equity Project Manager

Meeting materials:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description
1	Agenda	05/12/16	Meeting Agenda
2	Meeting Overview Memorandum	05/12/16	Overview of what is covered in the packet of materials and anticipated for the meeting.
3	Work Group Meeting 2 Summary	02/18/16	Summary of transportation equity work group meeting #2.
4	2018 RTP Status Report	04//16	Summary of 2018 RTP activities to date.
5	Updated Schedule	05/12/16	Updated schedule of Transportation Equity work group meetings.
6	Federal, State, and Regional Policy Overview Memorandum	04/06/16	Background information about federal, state, and regional policies which address transportation and social equity.
7	Memorandum Synthesizing Feedback, Findings, and Draft Measures	05/12/16	Overview of findings of community priorities and process for defining draft transportation equity measures.
8	Memorandum Outlining Potential Products	05/12/16	Overview of potential products to result from the Transportation Equity work.
9	Presentation	05/12/16	TE Work Group Presentation
10	Mtg. Evaluation	05/12/16	TE Meeting #3 Meeting Evaluation



**Performance Work Group Meeting #3
June 27, 2016, 2:00 to 4:00 PM
Metro Regional Center, Room 401**

Committee Members Present:

Name	Affiliation
Steve Adams	Wilsonville
Jessica Berry	Multnomah County
Tom Bouillion	Port of Portland
Denny Egner	Milwaukie
Christina Fera-Thomas	Hillsboro
Abbot Flatt	Clackamas County
Eric Hesse	TriMet
Bill Holstrom	Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Steve Kelley	Washington County
Katherine Kelly	Gresham
Karla Kingsley	Kittleson & Associates Inc.
Lidwien Rahman	Oregon Department of Transportation
Chris Rall	Transportation 4 America
Kelly Rodgers	Confluence Planning

Metro Staff Present

John Mermin
Kim Ellis
Cindy Pederson
Peter Bosa
Lake McTighe
Jamie Snook
Tim Collins
Caleb Winter

Others Present

John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute
Staff person, Oregon League of Conservation Voters

Welcome and introductions

Kim Ellis kicked off the meeting with a quick overview and meeting purpose – to 1) continue the review of 2014 RTP and Climate Smart model results and 2) begin discussion of refinement of measures.

Members of the work group introduced themselves and shared who they have been talking to about the performance work and what have they heard. Chris Rall, from Transportation 4 America, mentioned that *Planning for a Healthier Future* came out last week. Following the meeting, Chris provided a link to share with the work group. (<http://t4america.org/2016/06/22/introducing-planning-for-a-healthier-future/>)

Review agenda and brief update on the 2018 RTP

Ms. Ellis reviewed the agenda and provided an update on the Regional Leadership Forum #1. Ms. Ellis passed out an overview summary of the forum and mentioned that a more detailed report is online at www.oregonmetro.gov/rtp. The second Leadership Forum is scheduled for September 23 and will focus on the funding and partnerships needed to maintain and improve our transportation system.

Continued review of Climate Smart and 2014 RTP performance

*John Mermin mentioned that Cindy Pederson shared measures of VMT per capita and truck delay per truck trip, region-wide mode share for bike, walk and transit at our last meeting. Mr. Mermin then reviewed the handout with **non-single occupancy vehicle (SOV) mode share** table, which included:*

- The table (handout) describes the mode share for five scenarios: 2015 Base year, 2040 No build, 2040 Constrained, 2040 Strategic, and 2040 Climate Smart Strategy.
- The Portland Central City has the highest non-single occupancy vehicle mode share.
- The constrained, strategic and climate smart scenarios all show increases over the no build.
- The results did not show significant differences between constrained, strategic and climate smart scenarios. Possible reasons are that the model needs more drastic differences to show changes in mode share and that many underlying assumptions are the same under each scenario (e.g. land use, parking costs, etc).

Work Group member discussions:

- There was discussion regarding what shared ride includes. It is the carpool element of the non SOV mode share.
- Taking kids to school is included in the carpool, but kids on school bus are not included in the transit mode share. This should be reconciled and clarified about what is included and what is not.
- Pass through trips are not counted in the data reported. Within the table, the “Trips within” column includes trips that occur within those centers and “all trips” includes trips that originate or end within the center.

*Mr. Mermin moved on to describe the **Interim Regional Mobility Policy Maps** that are in the packet:*

- The maps in the handout present the model outputs showing levels of congestion for links in the travel model and areas where we don't meet our interim regional mobility policy.
- Since they're based on a regional model, the maps don't show the fine-grained level of exactly how far vehicles back up, but depict areas that should be examined further in local analyses.
- The policy/maps are not intended to dictate solutions such as spot-fixes or widening of roads, but rather point to locations where system-wide fixes are needed – including system & demand mgmt, bike/ped/transit projects, land use strategies, and road capacity etc.
- The No-build shows the most congestion. The constrained shows a reduction. The strategic shows a further reduction. The Climate smart scenario shows a level in between the

constrained and the strategic (its network is composed of the constrained plus extra transit investment.)

Work Group member discussions:

- The maps do not capture how transit investments are providing a benefit; there should be a way to show how we are moving people, particularly under the climate smart scenario versus the constrained scenario.
- Showing transit travel times might be useful in presenting moving people by transit.
- Plots showing where the scenarios differ from each other (difference plots) would be helpful.
- The 2015 base year congestion maps didn't seem to match what might be experienced today. For example, Highway 99W in Tigard and I-205 from Glenn Jackson Bridget to Airport Way. There should be some additional ground truth-ing done prior to publication for the public or electeds. Staff explained the volume to capacity plots show travel demand a two-hour period, which may be different than how people perceive the system they use today. In addition, ODOT and local government staff reviewed the 2015 and No Build networks in Fall of 2015 as part of background work to support the RTP update. Jurisdiction staff are encouraged to follow-up directly with Metro modeling staff on any areas that need further checking to ensure the assumed capacities are correct and that the model is assigning trips to the system properly.

*Mr. Mermin then reviewed the **schedule for measure refinement** for the 2018 RTP:*

- We will be discussing refinements to measures in 2016 (June, September and October)
- In 2017, we will be refining and setting targets for the measures.
- In 2017 and 2018, we will be refining our monitoring approach.
- To accomplish this schedule, we had to add an October meeting.
- Part one of the handout presents the performance measures the work group is discussing without input from another work group, part two are measures being reviewed by other work groups prior to discussion at our work group, and part three includes a MAP-21 infrastructure condition measure not recommended for discussion.
- Part one is further refined into three categories: a) measures Metro staff is initially recommending to be retained as is, b) measures staff recommends keeping with minor refinements, and c) measures that need discussion.

Work Group member discussions:

- There was a question regarding this process and the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation process. This group will not be responsible for the project evaluation for the 2019-2021 RFFA process that is already underway. However, our discussions will influence the next cycle of RFFA project evaluation (in two years).
- Reliability, pedestrians and people-moving measures should be included in our final list.
- Ensure consistency between the federal performance measures and those in the RTP. Staff explained that the federal measures are not yet final and are likely to change from the draft rule under review now.

*Mr. Mermin presented performance measure **recommended to be retained**:*

- There are several measures recommended to be retained, including greenhouse gases per capita, vehicle miles traveled per capita, bicycle miles traveled per capita, motor vehicle travel times between key origins & destinations, and number and percent of households within ½ mile of a regional trail.

Work Group member discussions:

- There was some discussion regarding the definition of a regional trail. There are specific criteria to define regional trails, and those are adopted in the current RTP and the Active Transportation Plan (ATP). The criteria will be provided to the work group.
- The work group would like to see how the performance measures relate back to the goals. While there is a desire to reduce the number of measures, it is important that we are measuring the right things and the evaluation is telling us what we need to know. This will be brought back at the next meeting.
- It's important to measure the connectivity / completeness of the system.
- It's important to measure the programmatic elements in the performance measures, such as the Regional Travel Options, and to identify a return on investment.
- It is important to keep these measures at a high level, each of the modal area plans can dig deeper.

*Mr. Mermin presented performance measure **recommended to be retained with minor adjustments:***

- There are two measures recommended to be retained with minor adjustments.
- The first is mode share – currently walking, biking and transit are reported at a system-wide level and Non-drive alone is reported for the 2040 design types (e.g. centers, industrial areas, neighborhoods, etc.). The recommended adjustment is report *non-driving* shares instead of *non drive alone* and to report for *mixed use* areas instead of all *2040 design types*.
- The second is the habitat impact – number and % of projects that intersect high value habitat. The proposed adjustment is to report the % of projects that are road widening vs trail projects, since they are different and have different scales of impacts.

Work Group member discussions:

- There was conversation about reporting mode share for the 2040 Corridors. This is a challenge because Corridors are long and narrow and don't work well with the model's transportation analysis zones. Mode share within mobility corridors (which are much broader than 2040 Corridors) could be tracked as a monitoring measure.
- We should continue to report the *system wide* mode share and mixed use area mode shares.
- Another tool we have is the State of Centers which shows how the centers are performing on transit accessibility and completion of the bike and pedestrian system.
- There was a suggestion to continue exploring whether to report industrial areas and employment areas as these may be areas where shared ride becomes important in the future if there are not directly served by transit.
- Ride sharing could be an important measure for health, congestion and first/last mile connections for transit. Ride sharing could open up the conversation regarding travel behavior and the unpredictability about how much that might grow (e.g. Uber, Lyft, etc).
- Members requested reporting of mode shares by mode for each center and industrial area, including shared ride to provide a better sense of differences that may exist before finalizing a recommendation on this measure.
- Currently, projects that intersect habitat are flagged on the RTP project for informational purposes for the public and for the project sponsor. The comment was made that this measure may be more appropriate for informing project development activities rather than system performance.

Mr. Mermin presented measures recommended for further discussion and refinement: congestion and interim regional mobility policy

- There is a strong desire to shift from measuring V/C and vehicle hours of delay as the primary congestion measures toward measuring reliability and people and goods moving capacity in regardless of mode. Many critiques of congestion as a primary performance measure – it’s correlation with strong economies, conflict other goals of region, it ignores biking and walking, often used to justify costly road widening.
- As for the interim regional mobility policy, we are not able to overhaul this (due to the complications of local jurisdictions and ODOT using its thresholds to require developers to help fund local transportation projects – when development is projected to increase congestion) as well as staff capacity limitations. However our work group will spend time in 2017 recommending guidance for how to use it (clarifying what facilities are of primary concern and how the table relates to other targets in the RTP).
- Questions posed to the group to spark discussion
 - What do we really want to achieve, uncongested peak periods vs increased reliability?
 - If we want reliability, what is best way to measure it?
 - How can we measure reliability of all modes, not just driving?
- Desire to move towards reliability measures (the current regional model can’t forecast reliability, but it can be monitored with though observed speed data – variations day to day)
- What is the best way to measure congestion in RTP scenarios in the interim?
- Research center staff have begun to explore different measures:
 - Vehicle hours of delay per person (current measure)
 - Congested vehicle miles traveled per person
 - Number of hours each day that the system is full
 - Number of hours of congestion during the shoulder periods (either side of peaks)
- Research center staff have begun exploring different thresholds for “congestion”
 - Adopted interim mobility policy (current policy tailored by location)
 - V/C>.90 (current performance target)
 - MAP-21 draft rule – proposed speeds (35 mph for freeways, 15 mph for non-freeway NHS routes)
 - 70% of posted speed limit (WSDOT system efficiency speed)

Work Group member discussions:

- The measure should relate back to goals/outcomes that we’re trying to achieve.
- Travel distance and travel time by mode over time would be interesting to track investments.
- Average speed could measure mobility.
- Reliability and access are important to this measure. Reliability is an important framework for a complete system. This should be used for all modes. A complete system is a reliable system.
- The V/C and LOS are a hindrance and getting in the way of development.
- Desire for more discussion/background of why V/C>1.0 was discarded as a threshold to test during modeling staff analysis. This information will be provided to the work group.
- Break out the freeways from arterials as the USDOT has done for the national performance measures. There could be different measures for freeways than arterials.
- The region is growing quickly again. All around the region people are feeling the pressure from growing congestion; this is a problem in areas not accustomed to urban levels of traffic, e.g. Wilsonville.

- Our current policy acknowledges that we can't build our way out of congestion during the peak periods, but we aspire to protect the off-peak periods for freight to help ensure access to industrial and intermodal facilities.
- Freight trucks try to travel at off-peak periods to avoid congestion. The freight working group is working through the issues of congestion and reliability too. Freight moving from California to Seattle often time route based on Seattle or Bay area traffic not Portland traffic.
- A work group member suggested a memo describing the types and uses for performance measures (e.g. to evaluate packages of projects (as is done in RTP), identify deficiencies in system (as done by ODOT), development review (local jurisdiction and ODOT), etc. The Washington County performance measures work was suggested as a good model for this overview.

Next Steps

John Mermin provided next steps and adjourned the meeting.

- Continue discussing performance measures in September and October.
- Continue to discuss new ways to measure congestion
- Develop system reliability measure(s)
- Other working groups are working through performance measures and will share with this work group at the September and October meetings.
- We will send out to the group today's powerpoint slides and Transportation 4 America's *Planning for a Healthier Future* report will be shared with the work group.

Next Steps for work group:

- Next meeting September 12th at 2pm to continue discussion of measure refinements
- The following meeting will be Friday October 14.

Meeting summary prepared by Jamie Snook.

Meeting materials:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description
1	Agenda	06/27/16	Meeting Agenda
2	Summary from April 25 th meeting	04/25/16	Meeting summary
3	Schedule for RTP measure refinement discussion	06/20/16	timeline
4	Considerations for congestion and reliability memo	06/20/16	Memo to inform refining measures for congestion and reliability
5	Non-drive along mode share in Regional Centers table	06/20/16	Mode share for walking, biking transit and shared ride by centers
6	2018 RTP update hours of congestion	06/23/16	Maps showing hours of congestion
7	Regional Leadership Forum #1 summary	May 2016	Summary