Meeting minutes

Metro
600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting:	Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) Workshop
Date/time:	Wednesday, April 4, 2018	9:30 a.m. - noon
Place:	Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Attending	**Affiliate**
Tom Kloster, Chair	Metro
Katherine Kelly	City of Gresham
Brendon Haggerty	Multnomah Co. Health Department
Glenn Koehrsen	TPAC Community Member
Mary Kyle McCurdy	1000 Friends of Oregon
Tom Bouillion	Port of Portland
Gerry Mildner	Portland State University
Ramsay Weit	AHS, Housing Affordability
Carol Chesarek	Multnomah County
Jae Douglas	Multnomah County Public Health
Bob Kellett	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Emily Lai	TPAC Community Member
Tom Armstrong	City of Portland
Karen Perl Fox	City of Tualatin
Chris Deffebach	Washington County
Jon Makler	Oregon Department of Transportation
Kelly Betteridge	TriMet
Mark Lear	City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation
Jennifer Hughes	Clackamas County
Bob Sallinger	Audubon Society
Kari Schlosshauer	Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership
Anna Slatinsky	City of Beaverton
Kay Durtschi	Multnomah County Citizen
Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
Todd Juhasz	City of Beaverton
Charlie Tso	City of Wilsonville
Michael Weston	City of King City
Lidwien Rahman	Oregon Department of Transportation
Steve Williams	Clackamas County
Jennifer Donnelly	DLCD
Denny Egner	Clackamas County, City of Milwaukie
Jerry Andersen	Clackamas County
Don Odermott	Washington County, City of Hillsboro
Nicole Hendrix	SMART
Dwight Brashear	SMART/City of Wilsonville
Jason Kelly	Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner

Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner

Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner   Grace Cho, Associate Transportation Planner
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner   Eliot Rose, Emerging Technology Strategist
Caleb Winter, Principal Transportation Planner Cindy Pederson, Modeling & Research Manager
Andre Lightsey-Walker, Intern   Marie Miller TPAC Recorder

1. **Call to Order and Introductions**
Chair Tom Kloster called the workshop meeting to order at 9:30 a.m., and welcomed everyone. Metro was marking the 50th year anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King. As part of this remembrance, a video was shown.

2. **Comments From the Chair and Committee Members** - None

3. **Public Communications on Agenda Items** – None

4. **RTP Policy Chapter Changes: Goals and Objectives and System Policies (*small group review/discussion format*)**

Kim Ellis provided an overview draft 2018 RTP goals, objectives and policies proposed as a starting point for review and discussion. In May 2017, Metro Council approved an updated vision statement and directed staff to review the adopted 2014 RTP policy chapter to identify and recommend refinements for consideration by the Metro Council and regional policy advisory committees in 2018. Staff completed a comprehensive review of the 2014 RTP policy chapter (including RTP goals and objectives) to identify gaps in policy, existing policies that would benefit from further clarification, and opportunities to further integrate adopted Climate Smart Strategy policies as well as policies for equity, safety, and congestion.

Policy review proposals for discussion include:
   1. Divide the existing 91-page policy changer into two chapters
   2. Reflect the vision statement approved by MPAC, JPACT and the Metro Council
   3. Update the RTP goals and objectives to make language more accessible; minimize jargon, focus more on people and outcomes, reflect values and priority outcomes identified through the process, reduce redundancy, and make objectives more specific and measurable
   4. Add new policy sections and related polices for safety, equity, Climate Smart Strategy and emerging technologies
   5. Update the existing modal policies and system maps, particularly the throughways/arterials, transit and freight policies and system maps for each network

For the remainder of the workshop, small groups discussed draft goals, objectives and policies to identify what might be missing, need for clarity and recommended changes.

A summary of the discussion and feedback provided follows. Staff will prepare a revised draft of the goals, objectives and policies for further review and discussion by TPAC, MTAC, the Metro Council and regional policy committees in May.

PART 1: Small Group Discussion on Draft Goals and Objectives
General notes:
- Important to see the word "congestion" in the goals. Want to see it mentioned as much as possible throughout goals.
- Add the word "safety" throughout all of the policies where possible

- Congestion in Washington County (top issue) – there is acknowledgement, but do not see it clearly in the documents
- Not clear who is supposed to do these things (Metro) becomes responsibility of local governments once in local TSPs and RTFP (add to introduction)
- Combine health and safety or cross-reference
- Add word reliable throughout where possible
- Reinforce connections among goals throughout
- Add historically marginalized communities throughout
- Consistent use of language - pick one term define and use consistently

A summary of the comments provided for each goal area follows.

Goal 1: Vibrant Communities

Table 1
- How come we only care about where people live and not where they work?
- Are we only investing in regional centers or in access to them?
- Questioning whether parking management should be moved to TSMO – parking also impacts quality of life, placemaking.
- Affordable housing language looks improved. Think about other services besides transit. OK with it focusing on regulated affordable housing.
- Is regulated housing too narrow in focus? Seems like we should have both at one point.
- We've been struggling so hard to get housing in the transportation plan that it seems like a win.
- General concern with language – Metro losing focus on land use and transportation with emphasis on housing.
- Concern about always twinning frequent transit w/ affordable housing. Are we winning if we gentrify every neighborhood with frequent transit and add some regulated affordable housing?
- Would also add access to parks and nature (instead of recreation) in lead statement

Table 4
- Objectives 1.2 and 1.3 refer to "frequent transit service". Significant areas in region are served by zero transit service. Acknowledge the need to increase coverage as well as frequency.
- Consider adding an objective to increase access to all elements of the (newly updated) regional transit vision
- Referring to frequent service is important.
- Objective 1.3 – do we really need to say "regulated" before "affordable housing units"
- Objective 1.3 – say "increase transit service close to affordable housing" (since this is a transportation plan). Currently it says to increase affordable housing close to transit. We want to convey that the types of places that need transit, should be served by it.

Goal 2: Shared Prosperity
Table 1
- Concerned about how we measure this goal. Businesses fail for so many reasons.
- Wonder if something fits here on the emerging technology front.
- Seems like the guts of this have been stricken. (general agreement) Is it better to focus on measurable stuff like passenger connectivity than "everyone can go everywhere all the time."
- Missing access to education.
- "Efficient" access comes up a lot. 2.2. is the only objective where we are trying to "improve" anything. Are there any other opportunities to "improve" things in the goals and objectives?
- The old 2.2, 2.3. and 2.4 seemed more measurable (general agreement) than the new objectives.

- 2.1: how is the system connected? Seems like there's a relationship w/ technology work.

Table 2
- Objective 2.4 move to equity?
- Objective 2.3 relationship to equity – 24 hour service or better, seems weak – be more specific and tie it to the problem
- Be specific - reliable, frequent, direct
- Redundant options (TNC, bus, MAX, last mile)
- "Efficient" does not capture need for around the clock transit to reach all jobs
- User responsive connections, frequency
- Access to jobs for all with focus on historically marginalized communities
- Access to all jobs, not just family wage jobs
- Crosswalk between equity – reinforce throughout
- Redundant system of throughways, etc.
- Freight is about connecting regardless of jurisdiction

Table 4
- Objective 2.3: "Access to jobs and talent". "Talent" doesn't fit in with the supporting text in the rest of the objective.
- Objective 2.3 is more of an umbrella. Not as much nexus with transportation services as the other objectives.
- Objective 2.4 – is it getting at lowering costs of transportation?   Aren't we trying to lower overall combined cost, not just the transportation cost?

Goal 3: Transportation Choices
Table 1
- "Active" might be better than "healthy" to support options.
- Why aren't we talking about VMT here? (it moved to 8.3) It's so much more than climate; seems like climate should focus on fuel consumption. Seems like it should still be in this section; this is how we address VMT.
    - Potential for VMT to increase w/ emerging technologies.
- Goal should start with "all people."

Table 3
- See issues for the aging population get better acknowledged in this section
    - Want to have acknowledgement that transportation needs change as we get older
    - Desire to see new objective which is adequate in recognizing older adults – ensure adequate choices
- Only covers the classic transit, walk, bike. This section should include emerging technologies and community-oriented flexible solutions
    - Desire for deviated routes, on-demand transit, and other flexible options
    - Some general agreement to add in an objective which adds in the other non-traditional options (vanpool, paratransit, etc.)
- Concern that there isn't language in this goal about prioritization of space and time
    - Specifically allocation of resource, such as right-of-way
    - Time, space, and price prioritization of alternative modes in the goal and objectives
- Desire to see an objective about pricing and would like to see it linked to modal choices
    - Be specific that the alternatives are present at the same time that pricing gets implemented

- ▪ There is general agreement across the entire table about this

Table 4
- Objective 3.1 travel choices seems similar to objective 3.4 – access to travel options. Consolidate into a single objective (Or change language to differentiate them more).
- Objective 3.1 may be rehashing of the overall goal.

Goal 4: Reliability and Efficiency
Table 1
- "because the transportation system is managed and optimized" doesn't seem like it belongs in the goal—it's about how we do that. Could be removed (general agreement).
- Need to highlight the importance of addressing bottlenecks.
- Not just about managing and optimizing, it's about design.

Table 2
- Add – addressing congestion at hotspots as separate objective
- Define reasonable
- Define concept of major travel corridors
- Redundancy – travel corridors, there are multiple ways
- Say mobility corridors instead of major travel corridors in Objective 4.6
- Parking management is missing – there needs to be an objective to cover and crosswalk to emerging technology policies – add back in somewhere
- There is overlap in objectives between demand management and travel information (Objective 4.2)
- Traveler information provided by marketplace, does it need to be in the RTP?
- Objective 4.6 add mobility corridors and "consistent with the purpose of each facility" (reference to speed and safety, lower speeds on arterials)

Table 3
- Missing parking management; either demand management covers this, but it needs to be called out
- The goal is currently written as management, but there should be acknowledgement that adding capacity should be included in this goal section. Particularly as it gets tied to things like value pricing. Absent in the goals, then capacity/expansion considerations get lost
    - o Can possibly get wrapped into Objective 4.6 – can get at it via reliability
        - ▪ Foothold is already here
    - o Have Objective 4.6 recognize current/existing congested corridors and future/emerging congested corridors
        - ▪ But others have said that currently as written Objective 4.6 already covers this comment
    - o Transit rep has concerns about language "related to maintaining travel times on all modes"
        - ▪ Should be specific and different for the mode by the corridor
        - ▪ Desire to see "right tool, right job"
- ODOT would not like to see adding capacity as part of this goal or in general in the goals; would not want to have "more roadways" in this goal
- Objective language on the lines of "reasonable and reliable travel;" use the right tool for the right job
- Disagreement about adding a goal or objective which would focus on capacity and expansion

Table 4
Objective 4.6 regional mobility - by including all modes in there, it raises a flag. What does it look like to maintain reasonable and reliable travel times for someone walking? Could this objective be more focused vehicular and freight mobility?

- Likes objective as it is. Since it gets at the value of mobility itself. A lot of things need to work for this to happen. If this is achieved, then we've achieved a lot of other things
- Prioritize methods of travel that move more people, e.g. put SOVs at bottom of priority list compared to high capacity transit
- The public and elected have expressed a desire for vehicular reliability more so than de-prioritizing vehicular travel.
- The focus of this goal has broadened from TSMO to reliability and efficiency. (not a bad thing).
- In some parts of region cars will be de-emphasized, and In others not so much (at least for the near future)
- Consider addressing objective 4.6 in the overall goal language.

Goal 5: Safety and Security
Table 1
- Hard to figure out what we're doing about security.
- Need to address hazardous materials passing through communities (general agreement)
- Strong support for 5.1.
- The goal should include mention of Vision Zero if it's not too jargony. It's a big goal statement.
- In 5.1, do we need to focus on "fatal and severe" injuries? Are we trying to avoid moderate crashes as well?
- There's some sense of trade-off that we'd accept more fender benders in exchange for fewer severe crashes.
- Does ADA belong here? Is transportation security also access?

Table 2
- Objective 10. 2 fits better under Goal 5.
- Security not just in the sense of crashes, but personal security (harassment, racial profiling, armed transit police)– make much more clear and bold.
- Objective 5.2 is not strong enough on security and safety for the public.
- Transit is the safest mode – but there are things we can do to make it feel safer; Access to, safety once you are on it (highlight in the context section and existing conditions)

Table 3
- Need some language on ADA
- Add in resilience into this goal
    - Seems like moving this to Goal 10 doesn't make the same amount of sense about a matter of fiscal stewardship

Table 4
- Mention transit infrastructure, since it's related to safety (e.g. buses in good repair). It's currently mentioned under objective 10.1 infrastructure condition. Should it be mentioned here as well? Danger of mentioning everything everywhere…(leads to a really long policy chapter)
- Seems like a short goal, without many objectives currently.

Goal 6: Healthy Environment
Table 1

- Address integration of green infrastructure (general agreement). Bob can provide language, should include urban heat islands.
- Stormwater management is very important in developing transportation projects.
- In the goal, we should talk about "enhancing" as well as preserving and protecting. (general agreement)
- Add "wildlife corridors" back into 6.1.
- Objective 6.3 seems too broad to be measurable.

Table 2
- Crosswalk to equity and technology
- Historically marginalized communities

Table 3
- Seems like Climate accountability is redundant with goal 11
    - Or better distinguish between climate accountability and goal 11
    - Or include an accountability objective across all goals
    - Or make a footnote for the purposes of explaining that reporting back and monitoring/accountability is a legislative mandate
- Should there be discussions of resilience and adaptation
- There also should be some "upfront language"

Table 4
- This goal is very disconnected from transportation. Add language that ties the environment to transportation.

Goal 7: Healthy People
Table 1
- Add "secure" into first sentence in goals (safe, secure)
- Why are Objectives 7.2 and 7.3 separate? Seems like they could be merged. Understand the importance of air pollution given Metro's work and state law though.
- What about residential proximity to pollutant sources?
- What about brownfields? More of a land use factor.
- We're planning a lot of new housing near roadways. Do we need to be sensitive to that or address it? E.g., Mitigate impacts of transportation-related pollution on existing and planned residential communities.

Table 2
- Add something about air monitoring.
- Objective 7.3 is missing a word or two after the word 'including'. Currently says 'including and air toxic emissions'.

Goal 8: Climate Protection
Table 1
- Mostly seems too redundant. Doesn't seem like we need a separate policy for these. Seems like they show up elsewhere.
- Clean vehicles could live under #6.
- What about urban heat islands? We also discussed addressing that under #6.
- We just adopted a Climate Smart Strategy. Concerned about removing that as a goal when we just elevated it.

- Lots of discussion about elevating importance of Climate Smart vs. streamlining the RTP.
- Supporting state efforts (8.4) is important to acknowledge.

Table 3
- Desire to see language that places prioritization within this goal: space, time, price
- Is the correct term barrier free or proving opportunities?
    - Reduce barriers and increase opportunities
    - Suggestion to the objective 9.2 be renamed transportation access
- Clarity in reducing inequities

Table 4
- Objective 11.8 has been folded into Objective 8.1, but something seems to have been lost. It previously included "invest strategically in streets and highways…" which should be retained as its own objective.

Goal 9: Equitable Transportation
Table 1
- We've lost something by removing Objective 8.3 – tying transportation investments to other goals, especially housing.
- Objective 9.2 raises question re: ADA rule. We're trying to do that in all communities. Understand the focus on HMCs here, but can we talk about ADA needs under safety?

Table 2
- Objectives 1.3 and 9.2 focus on investment is lost, Metro using investment power is lost
- Please define historically marginalized communities (in glossary)

Table 4
- Need to define equity somewhere in the document.
- As we focus on race, think about how these objectives might be applied in areas that don't have high concentrations of people of color. e.g. How do they address equity (using Metro's race-focused equity lens) in Clackamas county where there are less people of color.

Goal 10: Fiscal Stewardship

Goal 11: Transparency and Accountability
Table 1
- Something about engaging existing communities through liaisons—as a strategy.

PART 2: Small Group Discussion on Draft Policies
General comments
- Seems like there's still too much overlap between goals and policies. Some of these seem like policies
- How would we find something about congestion pricing?
- Is it possible to crosswalk goals and objectives?
- "Policy" sets direction – it's not an action.
- Consider what might be actions vs. policies.
- Should send the whole draft to communications staff to review.
- Question of where impacts on natural areas come up.
- Add the word "safety" throughout all of the policies where possible

- Add historically marginalized communities throughout
- Bike parking part of parking management
- desire to see language that includes "right tool for the right job" Used a bike-ped example for shorter trips
- Need to create new transportation options for senior citizens
- Acknowledgement of trips which extend outside of the region. Want it explicit versus implied.
- Broadly, want to see housing explicitly discussed in the policies; place policies which identify where housing should go
- Where does the issue of lack of industrial lands get recognized in the RTP
    o The issue is that a lot of industrial lands are way off the freeway
    o Is there a way to have a policy to have better connections of industrial land to the freeway land
        ▪ Could be more explicit in freight network policies
        ▪ Is it a transportation policy or a land use policy?
- Urban reserves – what is the policy around transportation infrastructure

Transportation Safety Policies
Table 1
- Focusing on eliminating deaths and high-injury crashes – seems like that's a goal rather than a policy.
- Not seeing anything on education and enforcement. Error is a cause of a lot of safety issues.
- People are not familiar with the "safe system" approach (#6). If that's supposed to mean something to people it's not clear what it is.
- Safety report identifies 4 major factors in the region. Seems like that should be at the policy level.
- You can make enforcement equitable. We have to figure out how to do it, but it doesn't mean it's not enforcement.
- Talk about speed cameras on each corridor.

Table 2
- #3 add word investments that benefit vulnerable users (make about investments)
- Make #4 about management
- #4 – security is a broader concept – make more clear
- Monitoring of data, make sure on-going (need to budget) before and after, program evaluation
- Safe System make sure to clearly define in the section
- Increase safety and security policies needs to capture the personal safety and security of people
- Access management strategy – include in the policy description
- #4 add "with a focus on reducing vehicle speeds"
- #5 do not like replicating, maybe acerbating

Table 3
- Want a sensible speed policy added into the language
- New policy – make safety a key consideration when defining system adequacy or deficiency when planning for transportation impact analysis

Table 4
- #5 – is good (safety as key consideration in all projects). However they were told in call for projects, that only projects on high crash corridors were "safety" projects.

Transportation Equity Policies
Table 1

- #1 seems like it's a little redundant with #2.
- #1 seems like "use this lens for everyone." #2 seems like "close the gap." Both are pretty verbose.
- These could generally be streamlined (general agreement).
- #1 "embed equity" doesn't seem as useful as #3-8, which are more specific.
- Do the subsequent policies cover everything in #1? Can we remove that?
- #2 and #5 seem redundant. Can we just combine and say "focus and prioritize" in #5? (consensus = yes)
- What is an "effort?" (#2)
- #8 is good (general agreement). Might move that up to #1.
- Generally seems to cover
- Don't like use of "ensure" (#8) – you can't guarantee it will happen. Use another verb?

Table 2
- There is overlap between #2 and #5, because efforts are not defined, can they be combined
- #2 is more about outcomes and investments
- # 8, focus on communities on color, but we need to add in other areas – be clear on "focus on race explicitly, not exclusively" (don't leave out income, age disabilities)
- How something is designed makes a difference based on race, income

Table 4
- Some policies have a direction to prioritize certain things.
- How to prioritize amongst all the different priorities within each set of policies.
- What does it actually mean to prioritize "projects within people of color" ? It shouldn't mean not doing anything else.
- Review the equity policies to see if some can be collapsed. Do each of the equity policies actually say something different?
- Consider collapsing #2 and #5; collapse #3 and #4(or clarify if they are meant to be discrete)
- #8 – the word "ensure" seems problematic as no one has figured out how to do it. Particularly if you're only focused on transportation element of displacement. No one thing, alone, has the power to "ensure" perhaps "strive for", "consider" - learn from SW Corridor process approach to displacement. Look for something between consider and ensure – "e.g. minimize, attempt"
- Try re-drafting without the "ensure" word. Consider deleing the first few words and beginning statement with "anticipate minimize the effects of…"

Climate Smart Strategy Policies
Table 1
- These are actions, not policies.
- In the implementation section, we should talk about how we're performing with the Climate Smart Goals.
- Climate Smart was an overlay on the previous RTP. Seems like that gets lost, and it's a little confusing.
- Are these taken verbatim from Climate Smart? They aren't always specific to transportation.
- But if it's adopted policy, it's adopted policy.

Table 2
- 9 add "that support climate goals and objectives"
- #7 age of no parking lots, should we be striving towards that – crosswalk to technology policy (build it and they won't come) will not need parking garages
- Parking today has effect on climate, make a change now and make an impact – do not need to wait and see if technology will fix it

- #7 should be stronger – use parking as a strong tool
- Clear nexus between good transit and parking
- #8 add something around enhance and support electric vehicles

Arterial and Throughway Network Policies
Table 1
- We should use "arterials and throughways" throughout if that's the name of this strategy.
- Feel like there's a less blunt way to say "planned for up to six lanes"
- #4 and #1 could be moved up to goals and objectives.
- #2 seems more like an action. What does it mean that it's "adopted RTP policy?" It means it's in 2014.
- Like #10.
- Nice to see congestion pricing addressed in #11. Could be broadened. Why only when a lane is being added?
- #12 is confusing. A lot of people don't realize that the OTP says you should do it. Still can simplify the language – "Consider all alternatives before adding a lane" – and clarify that the alternatives include pricing.
- Should refer to the transportation planning rule re: only adding pricing to new capacity when we discuss congestion. We want to acknowledge that that's federal and state policy.

Table 2
- Arterial network – confusing what is meant by arterial
- #3 "maintain accessibility" does not apply to throughways, either take out accessibility or separate out throughways, clarify that accessibility is about access to destination while using access management
- #2 add specific language on the function of throughways from OR Highway Plan "plus aux lanes" not and to maintain reliability to regional centers and employment areas and for freight movement" (ODOT staff to suggest language)
- Word highway is confusing – what is that? there is no highway in the functional classification
- Hwy 30 is a "highway" not an arterial, trying to get Cornelius pass designated as a "highway"
- Get rid of Principal Arterial and just use Throughway
- #4 add targeted aux lane language
- #4 change support to "include, integrated" support is mealy mouthed
- #5 and #7 there is redundancy, combine while hitting all points
- #10 add in access management
- #8 Green Street Infrastructure design (what does it mean?) – in the context section mention different
- #11 congestion pricing – add "in combination with increased transit" (ODOT)
- #11 where is the policy to generate additional revenue for multi-modal transportation improvements (ODOT)
- #12 urban to urban travel through urban reserves, some policy that recognizes this and provides guidance on how to do this (action to work with DLCD to amend the TPR to deal with this issue)

Table 3
- Policies 5 and 7 are redundant; can be collapsed
- Desire to see access management policy in RTP
- Policy 4 and 5 – talk about access to transit; but once on transit, getting priority to move on the system; so desire to see the policy language modified to address transit priority on the roadway network – ODOT agrees
- Policy 2 – change "and" to "plus" related to auxiliary lanes
  - Confusion if this is saying our standard is 6 lanes (with aux lanes? Or not aux lanes?)
- Policy 2 comes off as an action. Change language to "shall"

- Policy 10 – change from vehicle to person throughput; highest and best use
  - Add in access management into part of policy 10 which can make up for access management policy
- Add a policy in this section to lower speeds; in a context sensitive way; some facilities should have sensible speed limits; maybe driven by reliability; right tool, right job – ODOT suggested
  - Speed limits tied to safety outcomes goals
  - Mobility policy should be slow and steady

Table 4
- Be sure to include strong language on street connectivity
- Some of these are too prescriptive, e. g. #2 "up to six lanes" and #4 "up to 4 travel lanes"
- These policies seems disconnected to the goals & objectives, since we don't' talk about arterial and throughways (or congestion) much within Goals & Objectives.
- #9 - It seems weird to reference an "interim" policy
- General comment on arterial and throughway policies: Is there any priority to the order of them? Structuring them / grouping them in some way could help. A lot of ideas in here cross over into other sections

Transit Network Policies
Table 1
- #1 and #7 could be combined.
- Where is the transit vision statement?
- Should there be mention of youth transit fare?
- Did Transit Work Group discuss relative merits of coverage vs. frequency?
- Can make natural resource goals more positive.

Table 2
- Transit, not just frequency, but more transit designed to get people where they need to go, with parking maximums/no parking
- Need to spell out where transit needs to go
- Understand where people need to go on a daily basis – need more N-S transit
- Use same language for community places
- Crosswalk with emerging technologies, transit demand is regulated by technology, influence how system responds to demand
- #5 weave in recognition of bike transit paired trips (Hillsboro, public health) transit vehicle bike capacity
- #1 transit service designed to meet the changing needs of the traveling public to make competitive and usable modal choice - specify that without good coverage people will not be able to take transit
- In #2, add the word 'reliability' after the word security

Table 3
- Policy 3 – augment by saying "more reliable and frequent;" also places additional
  - Somehow bake in "reduce transit travel time"
    - Get to TSP and transit priority to make transit a more effective mode for other options
- Add in language to make transit the most enjoyable
- Also have language which includes "nimble" to recognize less traditional solutions
  - The current policy language isn't explicit in supporting less traditional/nimble solutions
- Alternative feeder system isn't being acknowledged in the policies

- Optimizing the transit service to the right situation
- Needs to have a bedrock principle which serves the 2040 growth concept/centers
- Transit should represent a viable alternative to support the implementation of congestion pricing – ultimately, how these things work together should support the right tool to the right job
- Want to see a transit policy which talks about jobs and employees/transit and workforce access/commuter programs
    - Also recognize that employer provided transit
- Desire to see transit provided and served in industrial areas language in the policies; also acknowledge flexible transit service
- Policy 5 or 6 – add in "to support jobs access/workforce"
- Policy 6 – End the policy at "new mobility services." The rest of the policy sentence doesn't make sense
    - Some disagreement on this. Others feel like you need to have the second half of the policy. Different word than "focusing"

Table 4
- Same conversation as with goals - #3 "frequent", nothing included about expanding transit access to areas that don't have it. Clarify the 2nd part of #3 – adding in "increasing reach of transit"
- #6 Tie into emerging technologies – adding more coverage (using technology)
- Use technology to make transit more efficient. In addition use those technologies whom conventional transit not an option. 2 different ideas. Don't need to be linked.
- Make this policy clearer. Filled with buzz wards.
- Try for clarity. Strive for utopia (technology gets you to the fast transit service), minimize dystopia.

Freight Network Policies
Table 1
- #3 is an action
- #2 seems like a goal.
- #3 seems odd: why do we educate on freight and not other topics?
- Generally, they need some work.
- Not all about freight – congestion has other causes. Tired of hearing that we need special lanes for trucks.

Table 3
- Policy 5 – add in language about protecting access to freight lands
    - Want language to get to comprehensive pricing to preserve facilities to access industrial
- Integrate access needs as the front part of the policy (adding planning part to the front)
- Freeways for long trips
- Desire to see language that says "protect and create industrial lands"
    - Dormant potential for industrial lands, but lack of connection to I-84
- There are concerns about industrial land conversions, so the issue of preserving facilities to access industrial lands could be problematic. Example is highway 26 industrial lands

Table 4
- #3 "educate public and decision-makers" why is this only in the freight section. If other modes don't need it, it might not be needed in freight policies. Does it rise up to this level? There was a concern in freight work group that decision-makers don't get it.
- Add connection to technology in freight policies.

Bike Network Policies

Table 2

- Like separating
- Do not like deletion of the specific distance (ODOT, Hillsboro) it is the counterpoint to throughways being long distance
- Bike parking
- #3 green ribbon – specificity that this is separated, high quality safe

Table 3

- Seems to confuse and conflict with pedestrian network; bring back the mileage into the language – differentiate.

Table 4

- "most convenient choice". Walking policy says the same "most convenient" –technically both cannot be "most" convenient.

Pedestrian Network Policies

Transportation System Management and Operations Policies

Table 2

- #2 Add access management before other tools
- #7 Add bike parking

Table 3

- Need for regional fiber optic backbone; prioritization; and policy to help acknowledge and get this implemented
  - This infrastructure is paramount to the success of implementing other transportation solutions and priority
    - This could be an action and not a policy, but needs a clear nexus

Emerging Technologies Policies

Table 2

- Support the roll out of 5g technology while balancing aesthetic and public space, support stealth technology
- Support deployment of interstate hotspots on transit (encourages use of transit and technology)
- Technology security (hacking, hijacking)

Table 4

- Policy #2 is pretty general – maybe add language to call out integrating emerging technologies with transit
- Consider adding more language to goals/objectives regarding emerging technologies

5. **Adjourn**

   There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:00 p.m.

   Meeting minutes submitted by,

   Marie Miller

   TPAC Recorder

Item	Document Type	Document Date	Document Description	Document No.
1	Agenda	4/4/2018	April 4, 2018 TPAC/MTAC Workshop Agenda	040418T-01
2	Work Program	3/27/2018	2018 Combined TPAC/MTAC Workshop Work Program	040418T-02
3	Meeting Minutes	3/7/2018	Meeting minutes from March 7, 2018 TPAC/MTAC Workshop meeting	040418T-03
4	Memo	3/29/2018	TO: TPAC/MTAC FROM: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: Draft 2018 RTP Goals, Objectives and Policies – Discussion Draft	040418T-04
5	Handout	3/22/2018	Moving from Vision to Action	040418T-05
6	Handout	3/29/2018	Proposed 2018 RTP Goals and Objectives, Discussion Draft. Proposed Changes have been accepted	040418T-06
7	Handout	3/29/2018	Proposed 2018 RTP Goals and Objectives, Discussion Draft. Track changes format	040418T-07
8	Handout	3/28/2018	2014 Regional Transportation Plan; Goals and objectives for transportation	040418T-08
9	Handout	3/29/2018	Proposed 2018 RTP Transportation System Policies, Discussion Draft. Proposed changes accepted	040418T-09
10	Handout	3/29/2018	Proposed 2018 RTP Transportation System Policies, Discussion Draft. Track changes format	040418T-10
11	Website Link	4/4/2018	www.nbcnews.com/nightly-news/video/remembering-the-assassination-of-mlk-50-years-later-1192156227851	040418T-11
12	Presentation	4/4/2018	2018 Regional Transportation Plan; Draft Goals, Objectives and Policies	040418T-12