



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

Meeting: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and  
Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) Workshop

Date/time: Wednesday, March 7, 2018 | 9:30 a.m. - noon

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

---

## **Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Adam Barber  
Katherine Kelly  
Brendon Haggerty  
Glenn Koehrsen  
Raymond Eck  
Darci Rudzinski  
Mary Kyle McCurdy  
Tom Bouillion  
Gerry Mildner  
Ramsay Weit  
Carol Chesarek  
Laura Weigel  
Jae Douglas  
Laura Terway  
Bob Kellett  
Emily Lai  
Paul Grove  
Tom Armstrong  
Karen Perl Fox  
Nancy Kraushaar  
Chris Deffebach  
Jon Makler  
Kelly Betteridge  
Mark Lear  
Lynda David  
Jennifer Hughes  
Talia Jacobson  
Bob Sallinger  
Kari Schlosshauer  
Mike O'Brien  
Jeff King  
Anna Slatinsky  
Kay Durtschi  
Jeannine Rustad  
Karen Buehrig  
Eric Hesse

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Multnomah County  
City of Gresham  
Multnomah Co. Health Department  
TPAC Community Member  
Washington Co. Community Member  
Angelo Planning  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
Port of Portland  
Portland State University  
AHS, Housing Affordability  
Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro  
Multnomah County Public Health  
City of Oregon City  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
TPAC Community Member  
Portland Home Builders Association  
City of Portland  
City of Tualatin  
City of Wilsonville  
Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
TriMet  
City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Audubon Society  
Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership  
Environmental Science Associates  
City of Forest Grove  
City of Beaverton  
Multnomah County Citizen  
Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District  
Clackamas County  
City of Portland, Bureau of Transportation

## **Metro Staff**

Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager      Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner  
Jeff Frkonja, Research Center Director              Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner  
Ted Reid, Principal Regional Planner              Grace Cho, Associate Transportation Planner  
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner      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. Introductions were made.

### **2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members**

Kelly Betteridge with TriMet announced they are recruiting for the position Eric Hesse recently vacated as well as the new GM.

Jon Makler announced Mandy Putney has accepted the position of Policy & Development Regional Manager at Region 1, replacing Kelly Brooks. The Major Projects Manager position is now vacant and will be open for recruitment soon.

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

### **4. 2018 Growth Management Decision: Buildable Land Estimates**

Ted Reid provided an overview of why Metro is inventorying buildable land as part of the work to inform the 2018 urban growth management decision. The inventory process raises some interesting questions around uncertainty in forecasting.

Jeff Frkonja provided a revised 2018-2038 Regional Growth Forecast Reference handout with additional information from last month. As the Urban Growth Management process continues with analysis of development trends, buildable land inventory, regional forecasts and other topics, the Metro Research Center has formed the Land Use Technical Advisory Group. They are asking members of this committee and your partners to help keep local officials informed and engaged with issues pertinent to urban growth management.

A timeline was provided with scenario forecasts testing, capacity forecasting, and the release of a draft Urban Growth Report (UGR) toward the end of June. The five cities proposing UGB expansions have a deadline of May 31, 2018 for their full proposals. Metro staff is working with proposers to establish forecast assumptions. New to the review process is an advisory group review of city proposals.

Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) identifies capacity by inventorying vacant land, and forecasting market-driven multi-family, redevelopment, and infill. Data for 2007-2015 show redevelopment and infill increasing in importance for development. Infill and redevelopment supplied more than half of new housing in the 2007 to 2015 time period.

Jeannine Rustad commented that the areas of North Bethany and South Copper Mt. are expected to be built between 5-10 years. With the right land brought into the inventory, vacant land will be used quickly. Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on the chart with percentage of developable land, comparing infill with vacant land. Glenn Koehrsen asked if rules and regulations were being factored in with the forecasts. Mr. Frkonja acknowledged the BLI accounts for adopted zoning. Tom Armstrong commented on the City of Portland issuing 7,400 building permits in 2007. There are still 10,000 pre-inclusionary housing units in the pipeline. They are monitoring the current slow-down in the market with higher labor costs and construction issues. Mr. Frkonja added that recent Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) construction is up markedly in the Portland area.

New data used to enhance BLI methods include multi-family and mixed use redevelopment capacity, ADU capacity, and residential and commercial proportional assumptions for mixed use zones. Two scenarios of redevelopment capacity were developed. One being a statistical analysis of observed 2007-15 markets, and price thresholds set by Delphi process used in the last cycle. These scenarios enabled Metro to reflect uncertainty in future redevelopment capacity, apply observed data (required by state law), address stakeholder feedback, better understand factors influencing redevelopment, and give Metro Council “decision space” to manage uncertainty.

The statistical approach provided key factors with noticeable effects. Factors push redevelopment in the same direction region-wide but vary in scale inside vs. outside Portland.

Higher tax lot value is less likely for redevelopment

Higher value neighborhood is less likely for redevelopment

Larger lot size is more likely for redevelopment

Closer to city center is more likely for redevelopment (included for Portland only)

For the price threshold approach, a panel of private and public sector experts set strike price thresholds by broad geographies. A chart was given illustrating how the two methods create different scenarios.

Discussion was held on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and the uncertainty of forecasting due to the future of Portland’s SDC waiver, the potential in other jurisdictions and uses other than long-term housing. Members requested information on how ADUs might be used as long-term housing and/or short-term rentals, what the economic impact would be using square footage with various size units, data that showed a mix of units with useful measurement for policy decisions. Metro staff will monitor findings from an in-progress survey by Portland State University’s Institute for Sustainable Studies that may address some of these questions.

The 2018 Buildable Lands Inventory Draft 3 Summaries was provided. It showed Residential Units Capacity, and Employment Acres Capacity Forecasts, with both statistical and threshold approaches. Comments included:

- Dramatically different numbers with these 2 approaches. How useful are these approaches with such variance, and will there be an interpretive framed approach for each available.
- How close to reality are these data approaches for making sense.
- Where are the age demographics with population projections in the data? Housing needs and sizes will change.
- Acknowledgement was given to the staff on time and effort.
- What level of transportation investment is needed for the land uses depicted in these approaches?
- Regarding parking lots/spaces, how is this calculated in the forecasts? It would help to define impacts of future forecasts with parking needs.
- More description with the logic between Portland and other parts of the region with these approaches.
- The statistical method appears to do a better job with redevelopment and infill locations, but greatly underestimates likely capacity, particularly in Portland
- Concern with the 2 approaches, given the unknowns, particularly with market pricing.
- City limits across counties and annexation issues. It would help to define these areas more clearly in tables and on maps.

## 5. Regional Leadership Forum #4 Takeaways and Initial Recommendations for Refining 2018 RTP

**Investment Priorities** Kim Ellis thanked those that were able to attend the Regional Leadership Forum March 2. The forum helped set up refinements for jurisdictions as we move forward. Ms. Ellis pointed to handouts provided for her presentation 1) Regional Leadership Forum Summary, 2) What we heard during the public comment period, and 3) the Discussion Worksheet from the Forum.

With the goal to finalize the 2018 RTP by the end of the year, work is being taken to incorporate these refinements on project plans. The Discussion Worksheet from the Forum shows mixed results, with some disappointment not making as much progress as hoped, with more work needed for funding. We are also working with limitations to what has been planned and developed to this point, staying within budgets and resources, and providing both regional and local priorities. Recommendations are being asked for areas of improvement as these are presented to TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council.

Referring to the Regional Leadership Forum Summary, seven key takeaways were formed as recommended ways for jurisdictions to refine their draft project lists to better meet the region's shared goals.

1. We can make more near-term progress on key regional priorities – equality, safety, travel options and congestion.
2. This is an opportunity to reduce disparities and barriers that exist for historically marginalized communities.
3. Prioritize projects that focus on safety in high injury corridors.
4. Accelerate transit service expansion.
5. Tackle congestion and manage travel demand.
6. Prioritize completion of biking and walking network gaps.
7. We must continue to build public trust through inclusive engagement, transparency and accountability.

Comments from the committees:

- The prioritization looks good with the issues we face.
- Surprised no environmental issues are on this list, such as storm water, green infrastructure, and climate smart. There is a need to call them out more specifically.
- On the discussion worksheet, safety good and bad news provides a misleading description saying 60% of projects are on high injury corridors, and less than half of projects on high injury corridors have safety as a primary or secondary purpose. More definition of safety needs to be pulled out from the data related to high injury corridors.
- It was stated at the Forum that HB2017 funding would meet or exceed transit smart services. Where is the data that supports this?
- There was a strong theme from the Forum on leading with equity.
- Regarding climate smart, with required state law and Metro with partners providing performance measurements for this issue, it was recommended we have the same performance measurements for safety and equity as they are perceived as top priorities. We should document how and why this was done.
- For the RTP adoption, the equity plan is part of this. A break out of costs/budget percentages is recommended. Example: high crash corridors
- Possibility and likelihood of tradeoffs. Knowing we'll have additional funding for transit dollars, possible different categories and projects may go beyond "advancing" projects. Each jurisdiction has its own constrained budget that we may now go beyond in future planning.
- With the potential project changes relating to RTP policy chapters, not all of the project movements need to be shown in the chapters. Placing them more in strategies is advised.

- Jurisdictions should share tools; we are not changing projects in the same way. It's challenging for local jurisdictions to view regional plans when boundaries are crossed.
- Lack of focus on isolated communities; with access to transit, different modes of transit can be utilized beyond big buses.
- The intent of project in the list can be misleading, especially with safety. Categories given for choice were not appropriate for the project. Recommended we name critical strategies and goals we seek to achieve.
- We cannot not have safety in projects. The challenge is how to identify this. The public will not be looking at the project descriptions, so the percentage of safety reported needs to be showcased for the value it is. Ways to consider are identifying projects that make it safer vs. new projects that are retrofitted with safety elements. Defining safety in next round needed.
- Documentation with safety the same requirements for documentation of equity in project proposals? Is there a same process for equity identification issues as there are for safety? Equity needs to include a funding criteria factor in projects that can be measureable.
- The top priorities from the Discussion worksheet and MetroQuest survey don't match up. Ms. Ellis provided more background on where these came from and will be compiled more clearly with the refinement process.
- More opportunities to talk about equity in the next phases of the RTP projects. In the next few weeks, guidance could come from Metro staff on equity issues that are more specific. A forum on these issues is needed.
- At past Forum no mention was made on Vision Zero. This was disappointing. We are creating transformational changes in planning and this should be discussed and documented.
- It may be difficult to leverage projects around when funding is not known. Jurisdictions are also doing additional work in projects in the RTP. It's challenging to include not only the project list priorities details, but tell a broader story.
- Safety related to roadways, yes. However, safety also relates to transit access and personal safety.
- If we can't modify the RTP, why are we here?
- Since Metro adopted the Climate Smart communities, we have known the primary way of implementing and reaching it was through the 2018 RTP. We are legally bound to do it. We either changes some projects or tell a bigger story. This includes equity and safety.
- Why are we not downsizing the evaluation plan in order to meet the priorities set?
- Table discussion at the Forum centered on air quality and impacts to low-income communities. Not mentioned in these materials. Measurements would be welcome.
- Safety projects (new) vs. safety improvements on existing projects.
- Jurisdictions are trying to meet all the criteria on projects. A recommendation to have a JPACT round robin of reviews was suggested.

6. **MAP-21 Performance Measures and Targets Input – CMAQ** Grace Cho provided an overview on the federally required Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) performance targets required to be developed by MPOs, state DOTs, and transit agencies. She noted for Metro, as the MPO, the MAP-21 performance targets are to be developed as part of the 2018 RTP and must be completed by autumn 2018. The reason she was before TPAC and MTAC was to discuss the region's input on two statewide MAP-21 performance targets being set by ODOT and need to be set by May 2018. Because of unique circumstances around applicability and eligibility, ODOT staff asked the Portland region to provide direction around two performance targets related to CMAQ. Metro staff has developed recommendations around these performance measures to provide to ODOT, which are outlined in the memo with the timeline and process for OTC adoption. Ms. Cho is available for future questions.

- 7. 2021-2024 STIP Funding Programs Overview** Jon Makler provided an overview of the 2021-2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), starting with the STIP Development Timeline. When concluded, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) will adopt in late June, 2020. The first deadline in the process is April 2018 with the 150% Lists. ODOT will scope projects on these lists to refine the cost estimates prior to programming the STIP; prioritization must yield the 100% lists by July 2019.

ODOT is responsible for the 150% list and 3-months scoping process. Fix-It programs (bridge operations, preservation, safety, agency mandates) have \$30 million allocation funds in Region 1. When the 150% list is available, ODOT will transmit to partners in the region for help identifying leverage with investments on these projects.

Leverage programs in the 2021-24 STIP include improvements to state highway (Region 1 Allocation: \$8,483,573), safety (Region 1 Allocation: \$10,680,000) and active transportation (Region 1 Allocation: \$7,746,000). These are for 3-year amounts. Leverage programs principles include meeting community needs not addressed by Fix-it projects, maximizing resources by leveraging priority improvements, allowing for flexibility while maintaining transparency, projects that should be consistent with plans and on a list of identified needs, and documented investments to inform outcome-based planning/programming.

Mr. Makler briefly described what activities in the leverage programs were ineligible or eligible. The basis of eligibility will help determine which projects to scope, which will be done in a very short time, using \$1 million total for scoping. Optimal data from leveraging and eligibility with partners will allow ODOT to narrow the list from 150% to 100%, using select criteria, public review and partner input. When the 150% lists are known, ODOT will be contacting jurisdictions to help identify opportunities for leverage. Mr. Makler and members of his staff are reaching out to local agencies and he welcomes direct follow up. Future consultations at the TPAC table will be available also.

**8. 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

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC and MTAC Workshop meeting, March 7, 2018

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	3/7/2018	March 7, 2018 Joint TPAC/MTAC Workshop Agenda	030718T-01
2	Work Program	2/28/2018	2018 Combined TPAC/MTAC Workshop Work Program	030718T-02
3	Meeting Minutes	2/7/2018	Meeting minutes from Feb. 7, 2018 Joint TPAC/MTAC Workshop meeting	030718T-03
4	Handout	Feb. 2018	2018-2038 Regional Growth Forecast Quick Reference, revised Feb. 2018	030718T-04
5	Handout	March 2018	Regional Leadership Forum 4 Summary	030718T-05
6	Handout	Feb. 2018	RTP What we Heard: online survey, community leaders' forum, Metro Councilor briefings, project website	030718T-06
7	Handout	March 2018	Regional Leadership Forum 4, Discussion Worksheet	030718T-07
8	Memo	3/7/2018	TO: TPAC/MTAC FROM: Grace Cho and Ted Leybold, Metro RE: MAP-21 Performance Measures and Targets – CMAQ Program	030718T-08
9	Memo	3/7/2017	TO: TPAC/MTAC FROM: Jon Makler, ODOT Region 1 Planning Manager RE: 2021-2024 STIP, Draft Leverage Program Guidelines	030718T-09
10	Handout	March 2018	2021-2024 STIP Funding Allocations	030718T-10
11	Presentation	3/7/2018	UGM Analytic Process: Buildable Land Inventory	030718T-11
12	Presentation	3/7/2018	2021-24 STIP, Background and Overview	030718T-12