

Agenda



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

2018 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE RTP Performance Work Group - Meeting # 5

Date: October 14, 2016
 Time: 9 a.m. to noon
 Place: Metro Regional Center, Room 401
 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232
 Purpose: Discuss recommendations to TPAC on updates to RTP
 Performance Measures
 Outcome: Finalized list of recommendations to TPAC

Working together across interests and communities can help ensure every person and business in the Portland metropolitan region has access to safe, reliable, affordable and healthy ways to get around. Find out more at oregonmetro.gov/rtp.

Agenda

9:00	Welcome & introductions	Kim Ellis
9:05	Partner Updates <i>Who have you talked to about this work? What have you heard?</i>	Everyone
9:10	Review Agenda & Brief update on RTP	Kim Ellis
9:15	Discuss recommended refinements to 2018 RTP system evaluation measures <i>(10 minute break at 10:30am)</i>	John Mermin Grace Cho Jamie Snook Lake McTighe
11:35	Updates from freight work group	Tim Collins
11:40	Next Steps for system evaluation measures	Kim Ellis / John Mermin

Meeting Packet	Next Meeting
• Agenda	TBD
• Summary from Sept. 12 meeting	
• Summary memo on Performance Measures recommendations	
• RTP System Evaluation Measures and Goals Comparison Matrix	
• RTP Regional Leadership Forum graphic illustration	

Directions, travel options and parking information

Covered bike racks are located on the north plaza and inside the Irving Street visitor garage. Metro Regional Center is on TriMet bus line 6 and the streetcar, and just a few blocks from the Rose Quarter Transit Center, two MAX stations and several other bus lines. Visit our website for more information: <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/metro-regional-center>



600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
oregonmetro.gov

**2018 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE
RTP Performance Work Group - Meeting # 4**

Date: September 12, 2016
Time: 2-4 p.m.
Place: Metro Regional Center, Room 401
600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, OR 97232

**Performance Work Group Meeting #4
September 12, 2016, 2:00 to 4:00 PM
Metro Regional Center, Room 401**

Committee Members Present:

Name	Affiliation
Jessica Berry	Multnomah County
Mike Coleman	Port of Portland
Christina Fera-Thomas	Hillsboro
Abbot Flatt	Clackamas County
Eric Hesse	TriMet
Bill Holstrom	Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Steve Kelley	Washington County
Peter Hurley	Portland
Judith Gray	Portland
Lidwien Rahman	Oregon Department of Transportation
Chris Rall	Transportation 4 America
Dan Riordan	Forest Grove

Metro Staff Present

John Mermin
Kim Ellis
Cindy Pederson
Peter Bosa
Lake McTighe
Grace Cho
Tim Collins

Welcome, introductions and partner updates

Work Group members and other attendees introduced themselves. Work Group members shared partner updates.

- Dan Riordan - Forest Grove has a work group that he has been updating on the Work Group's progress.
- Chris Rall – there is interest among the different RTP work groups (equity, safety, transit, freight) on how the input of the different work groups will be incorporated into the Performance Measures Work Group discussions.
- Peter Hurley – lots of discussion around performance measures in Portland. City is looking at removing the V/C standard (based on the Interim Regional Mobility Policy) from its TSP, which is up for adoption this Fall.

- Eric Hesse –interested in how the work on performance measures, especially transit, being done by the other RTP work groups will be incorporated into the Performance Measures Work Group.
- Bill Holstrom – DLCD is updating GHG targets, working with an advisory committee. Also reviewing the TPR.

Review Agenda & Brief update on RTP

Kim Ellis previewed the agenda and also shared an update on the upcoming September 23 Regional Leadership Forum.

- Work Group members briefly discussed how autonomous vehicles would be addressed in the RTP. Metro modeling staff confirmed that they will not be included in the modeling. Kim Ellis stated that autonomous vehicles will be discussed in the RTP, and that more information is needed.
- A member noted that an upcoming peer exchange on best practices for autonomous vehicles with PSRC in Washington that should provide information. Kim Ellis said staff would share information from the peer exchange with the Work Group. It was also noted that a session at the recent TREC Summit was devoted to autonomous vehicles and that PSU and ODOT are working on the topic.

Continue discussion of potential refinements to measures for 2018 RTP

Review Context for RTP Measures

Assessment of RTP Measures

John Mermin reviewed the handout with a matrix with the results of an assessment of the measures for understandability, goals addressed, data availability, user experience, and usefulness for project prioritization. Work Group members discussed the matrix and its usefulness.

- John described that the handout was partially based on an assessment done by Washington County & Kittleson in 2014 (understandability, usefulness for project prioritization, user experience), but with a few additional criteria added in and assessed by Metro staff (# of goals addressed, observed data available and modeled data based on metro staff assessment.)
- Overall Work Group members liked the matrix and thought it was helpful.
- A few times Work Group had to re-orient that they were discussing system evaluation measures and not project prioritization or monitoring measures. The Work Group discussed the difference between the different types of measures and that some measures would not be useful for one purpose (e.g. region wide system evaluation) but could be for another (e.g. corridor plan)
- Surprised to see #15 (safety) was red (low) under goals addressed, safety is so important seems like it would address more goals. John reminded everyone that the assessment was subjective and number of goals met could be reviewed.
- Interesting to note that the Congestion measure has only one green (availability of data) – illustrates that not a very useful measure.
- Just because a measure only meets one or two goals, or only one green, does not mean it is not important.
- Matrix is useful as a tool for the Work Group, but not for general communication. Staff agreed.
- ODOT uses performance measures for plan amendments and development review. ODOT will not eliminate certain performance measures, such as V/C, which are used for development review if there is nothing to replace them.
- Concern that performance measures are adopted region wide but then applied on other scales (development review). Response: it may be the same performance measure (e.g. v/c, safety) but is applied differently at the site level scale.
- DKS conducted a system review for Clackamas County that might be helpful as a way to understand the various geographic scales at which performance measures can be applied. Abbott will share it with Metro staff.
- It was clarified that the matrix does not decide anything – it is a tool to better understand the

- performance measures and their relationship to goals, project evaluation, etc.
- Project prioritization column is useful, and there will need to be other tools to evaluate project prioritization criteria/measures.

Summary of RTP Goals addressed by each measure

John Mermin reviewed a table showing which RTP goals were addressed through each measure. He noted that the highlighted/underlined parts were new information that had been added to a table that was first included in the 2010 RTP.

- Members found the table useful.
- Each goal is addressed by at least one measure
- The assessment is subjective and open to discussion.
- Useful to use this tool for other work groups – such as for transit vision, goals and performance measures being explored.
- Odd that only transit performance measure hits Fiscal Stewardship goal- seems like others would.
- What is difference between fiscal stewardship and accountability goals? Seems odd that every performance measure hits accountability, but only one hits fiscal stewardship.
- Maybe fiscal stewardship is more of a project prioritization goal
- Would be interesting to review how goals are structured – is there a hierarchy to them?
- How do you measure security goal?
- Should we measure every goal?

Continued discussion of measure refinement from last meeting

John Mermin reviewed the measures recommended to be retained and /or refined (following up from the last Work Group meeting).

Motor vehicle travel times

- Distinguish between higher and lower value trips in motor vehicle travel times
- Transit is missing (it is covered by the transit work group)
- Include truck freight travel times.
- Clarify this is by mobility corridor, not facility (transit is on a separate facility than highway)
- Origins and destinations – travel times for all sorts of origins and destinations, all types of businesses
- We need accessibility measure to “round out” this measure; travel times not a useful measure

Number and percent of households w/in ½ mile of trail

- Most members ok with this recommendation with a change from “trail” to “Regional Bicycle or Pedestrian Parkway”. One workgroup member expressed hesitation with using Metro designations. This change could be problematic if local jurisdictions do not have same classifications. Staff responded that the classifications should be consistent with the RTP
- Helpful, good way to simplify and collapse

Mode share

- The group is not comfortable making a recommendation at this time. Need to take to TPAC. Seems like a policy issue for TPAC.
- Need to explain that we cannot currently measure mode share as described in RTP
- What about the trip not taken, will there be a mode share target for that? This at least should be included in monitoring measures discussion.
- Shouldn't we look at where the projected job growth is going to be when determining

geography for targets?

- The accessibility measures under development may get us to the smaller geographies desired.
- Bulk of growth is in corridors but we cannot measure them with our tools. There are not defined boundaries for corridors, but we need to consider the implications
- Need to think carefully about the implications of not having targets for town centers and corridors
- Could it impact project prioritization if there were no targets for town centers?
- Will activity based model (DASH) be able to measure at finer scale? No, it will still use TAZ, but will eventually be able to go to smaller scale – parcel.
- If this is a measure that is included specifically to meet state requirements. That's okay
- We need a system completeness measure for all modes, including highways and freeways, including crossings and curb ramps. Also need connectivity measure, # of lanes on arterials and freeways vs ideal, arterial connectivity (are there arterials spaced every mile as intended in regional policy?) These would really help ODOT let go of V/C measure. Lack of data is an issue.
- Bring options to October meeting.

Habitat impact

- Work Group ok with proposal to not use this as a system evaluation measure, but to continue to use it and informational item to inform project sponsors and the public (via flagging projects that intersect high value habitat on RTP project list).

Congestion and Delay

- Staff updated the group on ODOT/Metro discussions – The direction we're heading is to defer to the OHP on congestion standards. ODOT agreed we're trying to preserve mobility on the freeways. We don't see value in the RTP setting congestion standards for non-freeway facilities. If local jurisdictions want to set their own standards for these facilities they would be free to do so.
- The RTP would continue to monitor the peak periods and attempt to maintain the off-peak for freight movement
- Work group ok with this direction
- V/C Targets would still be in the Oregon Hwy Plan and used for development review
- System completeness should apply to TSPs
- Amending OHP not up to Region 1 ODOT, though they are supportive of it
- However, local jurisdictions can adopt other targets with OTC approval
- Steve – delay is still a good measure at corridor level if not regional
- Important to keep watching California moving away from LOS

Discuss potential refinements recommended by other workgroups

John Mermin gave a brief verbal update of transit performance measure development (since Jamie Snook had a conflict), referring to Transit memo. Jamie will attend the 10/14 meeting to provide a recommendation to the workgroup.

Safety

John introduced Lake McTighe, who is leading the update to the Regional Safety Plan and noted that her group is a bit ahead of our group (and the other workgroups working on performance measures – transit, freight, equity). We've been focusing on system evaluation measures and plan to discuss target setting for our system measures as well as monitoring measures/data collection in 2017.

Lake's group has recommendations for all system evaluation measures, targets and monitoring. The focus of today will be system evaluation measures for safety. Lake presented a summary of the recommendations from the Safety workgroup.

System evaluation measure #1: % of safety projects in RTP (and % within underserved communities)

- The % of costs of RTP projects (that address safety) may be more informative than % of # of projects - e.g. a really big project (large geographic scope) may have more impact than less expensive ones.
- A member took issue with high injury network map (mostly eastside locations). Lake replied that the map matches up with Wash Co's draft safety plan map
- Several members recommended that the Safe Routes to school projects be defined.
- A member noted that we're moving in the right direction compared to the past when every project was considered a "safety project"
- Should all safe routes projects be treated the same way?
- Are any of the safe routes projects not on the regional systems? With limited \$ don't expand definition of what's included on regional system
- Lake described that there is a meeting with local partners this week to delve into definition of a safety project. She'll put together an FAQ

System evaluation measure #2 – Exposure to crash risk: Non-freeway VMT by TAZ (and within underserved communities)

- VMT exposure is big contributor to severe crashes. Evaluating pass-through traffic at TAZ level.
- Metro staff is still verifying whether we can do it and analyzing what the level of correlation between VMT & severe crashes
- Lake: the long-term goal is to develop a safety model. FHWA is interested.
- VMT exposure is an interim/blunt approach
- How are local road VMT extracted from model? Modeling staff replied that Centroid connectors in model sends traffic to regional system from center of zone.
- Lake: An area analysis, not an individual facility analysis.
- Speed is more important than VMT, so factor it in.
- Follow up: explore data availability for posted speeds. That's been a roadblock in past.

Recommended refinements to the Clean Air measure

- This item was deferred to the October 14th meeting

Next Steps

- Informational briefing at 9/30 TPAC
- Continue workgroup discussion of measure refinements Friday October 14 10am-noon
- Discuss recommendations at 10/28 TPAC
- 2017 meetings to discuss target setting and monitoring

Follow up action items

- ✓ Share outcomes from autonomous vehicles best practices peer exchange in PSRC
- ✓ Update performance measures summary of goals addressed based on input during and after the meeting
- ✓ Further refine and bring back for discussion: mode share, travel times
- ✓ Share information on development of Regional High Injury Corridors with Work Group
- ✓ Define "Safe Routes to School project"
- ✓ Update definition of a safety project based on input
- ✓ Explore data availability of posted speeds



Memo

Date: October 7, 2016
 To: 2018 RTP Performance measures work group
 From: John Mermin, Performance Measures Work Group Lead
 Grace Cho, Equity Work Group Lead
 Jamie Snook, Transit Work Group Lead
 Tim Collins, Freight Work Group Lead
 Lake McTighe, Safety Work Group Lead
 Subject: Draft recommendations on refinements to RTP System evaluation measures

Background

The Performance Measures Work Group is one of eight technical work groups identified to provide input and technical expertise to support development of the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The main charge of the work group is to provide technical input and make recommendations to Metro staff on development of transportation performance measures, with an emphasis on simplifying and decreasing the number of measures. Additionally, work group members have been asked to:

- Provide information to their organization’s leadership and/or staff about the progress of the work (in addition to technical and policy committee representatives).
- Integrate input from partners, the public and other RTP work groups (safety, transit, equity and freight) to develop recommendations to Metro staff.
- Identify issues that need to be resolved by Metro Council, MPAC and JPACT.

The focus of the 2016 meetings has been updating the RTP system evaluation measures – which are used to evaluate existing and future systemwide performance. The focus of meetings in 2017-18 will be on setting performance targets and establishing monitoring measures for the RTP.

Recommended changes to RTP System Evaluation Measures

At the October 14th meeting the work group will be asked to finalize recommendations to TPAC on system evaluation measures, with the exception of congestion, equity and freight related measures and recommendations still under development by metro staff and the equity work group.

The table below summarizes staff recommendations on performance measures based on discussion at the previous four performance work group meetings as well at the meetings of the transit, equity, safety and freight work groups. The Performance work group will have the opportunity to agree or disagree with recommendations from the other work groups. In either case, Metro staff will report recommendations to TPAC (and by whom).

System Evaluation Measure		Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
1.	Climate Change – Tons of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions (total and per capita)	No change.	The Performance Measures Work Group recommends no change to this measure. The region is required to measure	Performance

System Evaluation Measure	Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
		greenhouse gas emissions to help demonstrate whether the RTP is meeting state-required per capita greenhouse gas emissions reductions. During 2017 target setting discussion, ensure that the new target is consistent with statewide target.	
2. Vehicle travel – VMT per person (total and per capita)	Refine and rename – “Auto travel” and expand to report VMT per employee in addition to reporting total VMT, per person.	The Performance Work Group recommends this measure be refined and renamed. This measure provides information on the amount of driving in the region. VMT per employee may better factor in fluctuation in VMT due to economic swings. The recommended name change is to distinguish between auto and bike vehicle travel.	Performance
3. Bicycle travel - Bicycle miles traveled (total and per capita)	No change.	The Performance Work Group recommends no change to this measure. This measure will provide information on the amount of bicycling in the region.	Performance
4. Motor vehicle and transit travel times - Between key origin-destinations for mid-day and 2-hr PM peak	Refine and rename – “Multimodal travel times”	Metro staff recommends refining this measure to evaluate bicycling and freight travel times in addition to auto and transit for each mobility corridors. <i>Note: the regional travel model is not currently able to forecast walking travel times.</i>	Performance, Transit
5. Trail Accessibility - Number and percent of households within ½- mile of a regional trail	Refine and rename – “Access to Bicycle and Pedestrian Parkways - Number and percent of households within ½ mile of a regional <u>trail bicycle or pedestrian parkway.</u> ”	The Performance Work Group recommends expanding and renaming this measure to include major regional off-street and on-street bicycling and walking routes in the region.	Performance

System Evaluation Measure		Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
6.	Mode Share - System wide for walking, bicycling and transit, Non-SOV% targets by 2040 design type, by mobility corridor and for central city and individual regional centers	Refine and rename. Active transportation and transit mode share	Metro staff recommends narrowing this measure to evaluate mode share for the Central City and Regional Centers (as well as region-wide and by mobility corridor) as done in past RTP updates. This formally acknowledges that Metro cannot accurately measure mode share at geographies as small as town centers, industrial and employment areas. Chapter 2 of the RTP (p.2-22) and table 2.5 will also need to be updated to reflect this recommended change. These refinements are consistent with the state's Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) - the original impetus for creating these targets. Regional-level mode share targets will be addressed in 2017 as part of the broader RTP target-setting discussions.	Performance, Transit
7.	Habitat impact* - Number and percent of projects that intersect high value habitat	Under development.	Metro staff will develop a recommendation on this measure pending further discussion by the Performance and Equity work groups. Performance work group recommends removal of this measure and instead identify projects in the RTP for informational purposes for the public and project sponsors. The Equity work group recommends using this measure to assess whether there are disparities	Performance, Equity

System Evaluation Measure	Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
		between historically underrepresented communities and transportation projects that may impact habitat conservation/preservation, primarily focusing the assessment on roadway projects.	
8.	Congestion - Vehicle hours of delay per person <i>*defined in RTP as time accrued in congested conditions (V/C > 0.9)</i>	Under development. Metro staff will develop options for discussion by TPAC and the performance work group this winter. Discussions are underway with ODOT regarding updates to regional and state congestion measures and the Interim Regional Mobility Policy.	Performance
9.	Interim Regional Mobility Policy - Locations of throughways, arterials, and regional freight network facilities that that exceed LOS threshold	Under development. Metro staff will develop options for discussion by TPAC and the performance work group this winter. Discussions are underway with ODOT regarding updates to regional and state congestion measures and the Interim Regional Mobility Policy.	Performance
10.	Basic infrastructure* - Miles of (regional networks) of sidewalk, bikeways, and trails	Refine and rename - "Access to Travel Options – system connectivity." The Equity work group’s preliminary recommendation is to expand this measure to add street connectivity to sidewalks, bikeways and trails with an emphasis on looking at the timing of basic infrastructure investments in historically underrepresented communities. A methodology to measure street connectivity will need to be developed to implement this recommendation.	Equity

System Evaluation Measure		Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
11.	Clean air - Tons of transportation related air pollutants (e.g. CO, ozone, PM-10)	Refine air pollutants reported.	Metro staff recommends this measure be refined. This is an important measure for evaluating transportation impact on air quality and human health. Pollutants reported may change pending further consultation with DEQ.	Metro Staff
12.	Affordability* - Combined cost of housing and transportation	Refine methodology.	The Equity work group recommends this measure with the recognition that there are a number of methodological components that need further work in order to be useful. Transit Work Group has expressed concerns that current tools and methods won't capture the transit cost component very well. Work will continue to develop a methodology.	Equity, Transit
13.	Access to Daily Needs* - Number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by bicycling & public transit for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations	Refine and rename - "Access to Places."	Metro staff recommends this measure be renamed and refined to: 1) measure access by bicycling, walking, transit, driving; 2) adjust the time sheds for each mode; and 3) define existing "daily needs" consistent with other similar efforts, including the TriMet Equity Index. This recommendation reflects discussion and input from the Equity and Transit work groups.	Equity, Transit
14.	Access to Jobs* - Number of jobs (classified by wage groups – low, middle, and high) accessible within 30 minutes by auto; 45 minutes by transit; 30 minutes by	Add as a new measure.	The Equity Work Group recommends this measure. Access to jobs is a significant transportation priority identified by historically	Equity, Transit

System Evaluation Measure		Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
	bike, and 20 minutes by walking.		underrepresented communities. The Transit Work Group also expressed support for this measure.	
15.	Transit productivity - Boarding rides per revenue hour for HCT & bus	No change.	The Transit Work Group recommends this measure. The measure provides information on the productivity and efficiency of transit service provided.	Transit
16.	Transit revenue hours – revenue hours by transit mode	Add.	This measure was recommended through Climate Smart Strategy and by the Transit Work Group. The measure provides information on the amount of transit service provided.	Transit
17.	Transit coverage – number and share of households, low-income households and employment within ¼- mile of high capacity transit or frequent service transit	Add.	This measure was recommended through the Climate Smart Strategy and by the Transit Work Group. This measure provides information on how much of the region’s households and jobs are served by transit.	Transit
18.	Access to transit – percent of bike or pedestrian network gaps completed within ½-mile of transit	Add.	The Transit Work Group recommends this measure. This is seen as a subset to the bike and pedestrian system completeness measure. This also supports the transit supportive elements part of the regional transit vision.	Transit
19.	Safety - Fatal & severe crashes for ped, bike, motorists	Move to RTP monitoring measures.	This measure cannot be used as a system evaluation measure due to the inability of the regional travel model to directly predict crashes.	Safety
20.	Safety* -Percent of safety projects in the RTP investment packages region-wide, and the percent of safety projects in areas with	Add as new measure.	Safety is a key concern of the RTP and has not been part of past system evaluations. This measure will assess whether safety	Safety, Equity

System Evaluation Measure		Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
	historically underrepresented communities.		investments are being made disproportionately.	
21.	Safety* - Exposure to crash risk through the sum of all non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in Transportation Area Zones (TAZ) for RTP investment packages region-wide, and in historically underrepresented communities.	Add as new measure.	Safety is a key concern of the RTP and has not been part of past system evaluations. This is an interim measure until a safety and crash predictive model is developed involving other factors. Measuring transportation safety is a priority topic area for historically underrepresented communities and there is some interest in looking at forecastable indicators to flag potential transportation safety issues.	Safety, Equity
22.	Freight reliability - Hours of delay per truck trip	Refine and rename – “Freight truck delay”	The Freight work group recommends evaluating delay per truck trip exclusively on <u>regional freight network</u> rather than entire roadway system. Also, the measure should be called “Freight truck delay” since it does not measure reliability. A reliability measure for current conditions has been developed to include in RTP Monitoring Measures.	Freight
23.	Traffic delay on the regional freight network for autos and freight trucks	Under development.	<i>Under development by RTP Freight work group</i>	Freight
24.	Cost of freight delay - Total cost of delay on freight network	Under development.	<i>Under development by RTP Freight work group</i>	Freight
25.	Freight Accessibility	Under development.	<i>Under development by RTP Freight workgroup</i>	Freight
26.	Freight Congestion – Map locations and calculate number miles on throughways, arterials, and	Under development.	Metro staff will develop options for discussion by TPAC and the performance workgroup this winter.	Freight

System Evaluation Measure	Summary of Recommendation (e.g. No change, remove, refine, rename, add)	Rationale / notes	Work groups that have provided input on this measure
the regional freight network that exceed RTP defined congested conditions.		Discussions are underway with ODOT regarding updates to regional and state congestion measures and the Interim Regional Mobility Policy.	

** Reflects the transportation priorities identified by historically underrepresented communities and will serve as the basis for the federally-required Title VI Benefits and Burdens analysis.*

Next Steps

Metro staff will present recommendations on RTP System evaluation measures to TPAC on October 28.

Attachment 1. RTP System Evaluation Measures and RTP Goals Comparison (Performance work group 10/14/16)

(Assessment based on RTP performance work group recommendations adopted in 2010, except for those underlined which are based on 2016 staff assessment)

	RTP System Evaluation Measures	RTP Goals									
		Foster Vibrant Communities and Compact Urban Form	Sustain Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity	Expand Transportation Choices	Effective and Efficient Management of System	Enhance Safety and Security	Promote Environmental Stewardship	Enhance Human Health	Demonstrate leadership reducing greenhouse gas emissions	Ensure Equity	Ensure Fiscal Stewardship
Existing RTP system evaluation measures	Vehicle miles traveled (total and per capita)	●	■	●	■	■	●	●	■		
	<u>Bicycle miles traveled (total and per capita)</u>	■		■			■	■	■		
	Total delay and cost of delay on the regional freight network in mid-day and PM peak (auto & truck delay)		●		●						
	Motor vehicle and transit travel time between key origin-destinations for mid-day and 2-HR PM peak	●	●	●	●						
	Congestion - Location and number of miles of throughways, arterials, and regional freight network facilities that exceed RTP interim regional mobility policy thresholds in mid-day and 2-HR PM peak		●		●	■	■		■		
	Mode share and non-drive alone trips system-wide, by mobility corridor and for central city and individual regional centers (Number of daily walking, bicycling, shared ride and transit trips and % by mode)	●	■	●	●		●	●	■		
	Transit productivity (transit boarding rides per revenue hour) for High Capacity Transit (HCT) and bus	●		●		■	■	■	■		
	Number and percent of households within ½-mile of regional trail system	■	■	●		■	●	●	■	●	
	Environmental justice measure (under development) (See affordability, access, safety, environmental and health measures below)			●						●	
	Tons of transportation-related air pollutants (e.g. CO, ozone, and PM-10)		■	●			●	●		■	
	Tons of transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. CO ₂)		■	●			●	■	■		
	Percent of projects that intersect high value habitat areas (Potential to be updated by "Resource Habitats and Infrastructure" below)	●					●				
	<u>Vehicle delay per person</u>		■		■						
	<u>Hours of truck delay per truck trip</u>		■		■						
	<u>Miles of Sidewalk, bikeways and trails</u> <u>(Potential to be replaced by #22 below)</u>	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	
	<u>Fatalities and Serious Injuries</u>	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	
Average household combined cost of housing and transportation (See affordability measure below)		●							●		
Number of essential destinations accessible within 30 min by bicycling & public transit for low income, minority, senior & disabled populations (data under development) (See Access measures below)	●		●			●	●		●		
New or refined measures (under development by equity, safety, and transit work groups)	Affordability – Combined Housing and Transportation Expenditure TBD – METHOD UNDER DEVELOPMENT										
	Access to Transit – percent of bicycle or pedestrian network gaps completed within ½ mile of transit (to be a subset of Access to Travel Options measure below)	■		■		■	■	■	■	■	
	Transit Coverage - number and share of households, low-income households and employment within ¼- mile of high capacity transit or frequent service transit	■		■		■	■	■	■	■	
	Transit Revenue Hours – revenue hours by transit mode	■		■		■	■	■	■	■	
	Access to Places - Number of essential destinations accessible within 30 minutes by bicycling & public transit for low-income, minority, senior and disabled populations	■	■	■			■	■		■	
	Access to Jobs - Number of jobs (classified by wage groups – low, middle, and high) accessible within 30 minutes by auto; 45 minutes by transit; 30 minutes by bike, and 20 minutes by walking	■	■	■			■	■		■	
	Access to Travel Options – system connectivity	■		■		■	■	■	■	■	
	Safety – Infrastructure Disparities – Safety Investments on the High Injury Corridor		■		■		■	■	■	■	
	Safety – Exposure – Non-Freeway VMT exposure per capita Exposure to crash risk through the sum of all non-interstate vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in Transportation Area Zones (TAZ) for RTP investment packages region-wide, and in historically underrepresented communities.		■		■			■		■	
	Environmental and Health Impacts – Transportation emissions exposure TBD-METHOD UNDER DEVELOPMENT										
	Resource Habitats and Infrastructure	■					■	■		■	
Freight Accessibility TBD – METHOD UNDER DEVELOPMENT											
Future research	Person throughput within congested corridors										

There are no system evaluation measures for the "Ensure Fiscal Stewardship and Deliver Accountability goals."

There are no system evaluation measures for the "Ensure Fiscal Stewardship and Deliver Accountability goals."

Building the future we want

REGIONAL LEADERSHIP FORUM 2

Metro
September 23, 2016

WELCOME

INCLUSIVE

LET'S GET IN A

CYRENA

GRESHAM

TECH IS GOOD, BUT REMEMBER

HEART!

BIG AND BOLD

COLLECTIVE MENTALITY

IT'S ABOUT CONNECTIVITY...

AND MULTIPLE MODES

SAFE, RELIABLE, AFFORDABLE AND HEALTHY FOR ALL!

WE LIVE OUR LIVES IN A LARGER COMMUNITY

BEAVERTON

PLAN

CHANGE

KEEP THE GHOST OF THE FUTURE IN MIND...

REMAINING CONNECTED IS ESSENTIAL

Regional Leadership Forum 2 | Building the Future We Want | Oregon Convention Center, Portland OR | Sept. 23, 2016

The Metro Council convened MPAC, JPACT and community and business leaders to foster leadership and collaboration to address regional transportation challenges through the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan. Working together across interests and communities can help ensure every person and business in the Portland metropolitan region has access to safe, reliable, affordable and healthy ways to get around. Find out more at oregonmetro.gov/rtp.



Graphic recording of presentations and conversations heard at the Regional Leadership Forum 2, "Building the future we want," held on Sept. 23, 2016, at the Oregon Convention Center, Portland, OR. These illustrations were created by Darren Cools for Metro to support the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan. Find out more at oregonmetro.gov/rtp.



Graphic recording created by Darren Cools for Metro to support the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan. Find out more at oregonmetro.gov/rtp.

