



# Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) workshop meeting**

Date/time: Wednesday, February 19, 2020 | 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

---

## **Members and Guests Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Jae Douglas  
Katherine Kelly  
Jeff Owen  
Jennifer Donnelly  
Anne Debbaut  
Chris Deffebach  
Ramsey Weit  
Marlee Schuld  
Erika Palmer  
Lynda David  
Erin Wardell  
Mike Foley  
Jaimie Huff  
Cole Grisham  
Glen Bolen  
Steve Williams  
Wilson Munoz  
Shaun Brown  
Erica McCormick  
Kari Schlosshauer  
Carol Chesarek  
Adam Barber  
David Lentzner  
Brendon Haggerty  
Mike Weston  
Laurie Lebowsky  
Eric Hesse  
Laura Hanson  
Thuy Tu  
Allison Pynch

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Multnomah Co. Health Dept., Environmental Health  
City of Gresham  
TriMet  
Department of Land Conservation & Development  
Department of Land Conservation & Development  
Washington County  
Housing Affordability Organization Representative  
City of Troutdale  
Washington County, Other Cities  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Washington County  
STAC  
City of Happy Valley  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Clackamas County  
TPAC member  
Columbia County  
Cascade GIS and Consulting  
Safe Routes to School Partnership  
Multnomah County Citizen Alternate MTAC  
Multnomah County  
Multnomah County Emergency Management  
Multnomah County Health  
King City  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
City of Portland  
RDPO  
Thuy Tu Consulting  
Salus Resilience

## **Metro Staff Attending**

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner      Jeff Frkonja, Research Center Director  
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner      Cary Stacey, Project Manager  
Noel Mickelberry, Associate Transportation Planner      Eliot Rose, Transportation Tech Strategy  
Jake Lowell, Planning Intern      Marie Miller, TPAC & MTAC Recorder

## 1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chairman Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 10 a.m. Introductions were made.

## 2. Committee and Public Communications on Agenda Items

- Glen Bolen introduced Cole Grisham with the Region 1 Oregon Department of Transportation office, who will serve as interim liaison to MTAC for a temporary period.

## 3. Minutes Review from January 15, MTAC meeting

No corrections or additions were noted to the January 15, 2020 Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting.

## 4. Regional Emergency Transportation Routes (ETR) Update – Draft Criteria and Methodology (Kim Ellis, Metro/Laura Hanson, RDPO/Thuy Tu, Thuy Tu Consulting/Allison Pyrich, Salus Resilience, Erica McCormick, Cascade GIS and Consulting)

The Regional Emergency Transportation Routes (ETR) update project team presented an overview of the project and the draft evaluation framework criteria for feedback. The project is updating regional emergency transportation routes designated for the five-county Portland-Vancouver metropolitan region, which includes Clackamas, Columbia, Multnomah and Washington counties in Oregon and Clark County in Washington. The routes were last updated in 2006.

The project approach was reported as:

Step 1: Define ETRs

Step 2: Compile available potential RETR routes

Step 3: Develop and refine evaluation framework for RETR update

Step 4: Evaluate potential RETRs

Step 5: Report back results

Step 6: Refine and recommend RETR routes

The timeline of the project work plan was provided. In Spring-Winter 2019, the team reviewed the policy framework and best practices, collected data, and engaged with the ETR workgroup. Work continues in Winter 2019- Spring 2020 to design the regional ETR refinement process. The project team compiled ETR definitions, criteria and methodologies based on recommendations and best practices from the workgroup. Briefings on draft criteria and recommended refinement process are scheduled from February through early May 2020 to seek feedback and validation for the draft criteria and refinement process. This Summer 2020, the project team will apply the validated criteria and refinement process to develop proposed designations of updated regional ETRs. By Fall 2020, the final regional ETR maps and documentation will be prepared for endorsement by policymakers, to be completed by February 2021. A dissemination workshop will be held in the first quarter of 2021 to share the updated regional ETR maps, data and project recommendations for follow-on work.

Critical infrastructure and essential facilities were shown grouped into three categories: State/Regional, County/City, and Community/Neighborhood. Critical infrastructure in this case includes lifelines other than the roadway transportation network, such as water, wastewater, electricity, fuel, communications, and intermodal transportation (e.g., transit, rail, air, and waterway). Essential facilities include hospitals and health care facilities; Emergency Operation Centers (EOCs); police and

fire; public works facilities; state, regional, and local points of distribution (PODs); designated debris management sites; and shelters and community centers.

The project team defined ETRs as routes used during and after a major regional emergency or disaster to move resources and materials including essential supplies, debris, fuel, equipment, and personnel (first responders) and patients within and across jurisdictional boundaries. The team presented four tiers of ETRs that have emerged from review of existing routes:

1. Statewide Seismic Lifeline Routes (SSLRs)

State-owned roadways pre-designated by the state as priority transportation routes in Oregon and Washington. SSLRs provide key emergency response connections between regions within Oregon and Washington. Their primary function is to provide “a network of streets, highways, and bridges to facilitate emergency services response and to support rapid economic recovery after a disaster”.

2. Regional Emergency Transportation Routes (RETRs)

A network of state- and locally owned (county and city) roadways pre-designated by the region as priority transportation routes that can best provide connectivity for emergency operations in the region in the event of a major disaster or earthquake. These routes are priorities targeted during an emergency for rapid damage assessment and debris clearance and used to facilitate life-saving and life-sustaining response activities throughout the region.

3. Local Emergency Transportation Routes (LETRs)

Locally owned roadways, pre-designated by local agencies (county and city) as priority transportation routes intended to provide a local network of arterials, collector and local streets that will connect LERR to RETRs. They are generally used to connect more City/County critical infrastructure and essential facilities either directly or via RETRs.

4. Local Emergency Response Routes (LERRs)

Locally owned roadways intended to provide a network of streets to facilitate prompt response to routine fire, police, and medical emergencies within a single jurisdiction. LERRs also provide a connection from LETRs to Community/Neighborhood facilities and services, such as shelters, medical facilities, and community PODs. These facilities are often not pre-designated and can be defined based on the community needs, scale of the disaster and resulting damage.

The draft regional ETRs evaluation criteria were presented with information about each of the four categories of criteria: (1) connectivity and access, (2) route resilience, (3) route characteristics and (4) community and equity.

The project team also presented emerging recommendations for future work including:

- Plan for management of ETRs and transition from emergency response to recovery;
- Conduct vulnerability assessments of ETRs considering all hazards;
- Integrate ETRs in future transportation and emergency planning efforts and plans;
- Develop public information and messaging about ETRs;

- Consider active transportation, such as bike and pedestrian access needs;
- Evaluate jurisdictional boundaries for continuity;
- Address vulnerable populations in more detailed community-based planning.

Comments from the committee:

- Cole Grisham (ODOT) asked how Metro planned to use information from this study. Kim Ellis reported that results will help inform the next update to RTP (due in 2023), including identifying priorities to address needs to increase resilience of the transportation system.
- Adam Barber (Multnomah County) asked if after wildfires triggering landslides was being considered in this study. Allison Pynch reported that this would likely be recommended for future work as a specific type of hazard most commonly approached with local agencies working on them.
- Jeff Owen (TriMet) noted the good participation from regional partners in this effort. Were there others needed to be contacted? Kim Ellis reported that committee members were encouraged to reach out to public works and emergency management staff in their respective agencies that have been involved with the ETR working group. The project involves cross disciplines involving emergency planning and regional transportation planning with efforts benefiting many levels of planning in the region.
- Jaimie Huff (Happy Valley) asked if the project will include infrastructure modeling to see the effect of changes in the availability of ETRs in the event of a disaster. The team noted that transportation modeling is outside the scope and budget of this project but that recommendations could be made to evaluate such potential effects of a disaster to inform infrastructure upgrades and future resilience and recovery efforts.
- Steve Williams (Clackamas County) noted the City of Portland Bull Run water reservoirs located in Clackamas County, and concern with an emergency response involving an aging bridge that could be damaged affecting accessibility in this area. Allison Pynch reported the project team is familiar with the vulnerability of the bridge in this area and will consider access to these types of essential facilities as part of the ETR update. Cole Grisham (ODOT) noted that federal funding may soon be available; where States can apply for grant funding for regional priorities. Identifying these types of vulnerabilities as well as having the support from counties, Portland Water Bureau resilience study and other data can help make the case and obtain funding for these types of projects.
- Cole Grisham (ODOT) noted the project study includes Columbia County, outside Metro boundary area raised questions about how has this informed work plans in Columbia County. Laura Hanson noted the county has participated in this project and other RPDO efforts to make the region resilient. The County has a small number of roads that are likely to experience significant impacts. Recommendations for future work including evaluating how the region's waterways can be involved in the event of an emergency or disaster.
- Erin Wardell (Washington County) noted the importance of considering roadway tunnels in the evaluation (i.e. westside) and challenges to landslides in hill areas. It was also noted that people can easily be trapped in local areas where local transportation may not be accessible in emergencies. It was suggested to look at regular occurrences of emergencies encountered in traffic and weather conditions which could provide useful data scenarios to prepare for all emergencies.

- Chairman Kloster (Metro) asked if data on flood maps were useful for emergency planning. Allison noted ODOT working on their climate vulnerability study for transportation system now. However, the region's flood level data and forecasting for future flood areas would prove challenging for Oregon and Washington. Higher flood levels and more frequent flooding could be expected.
- Jaimie Huff (Happy Valley) asked about the criteria with possible separations of biking and walking on emergency transportation routes. Allison Pynch noted that uses and priorities are being considered for routes, such as freight, bike and pedestrian accessibility, or the possible need to restrict certain routes for emergency response only. The project is concerned with immediate accessibility for getting people home, to work and ongoing work in recovery routes. Future work can involve local agencies and jurisdictions to address bike and pedestrian access needs to support recovery and resiliency efforts.

#### **5. Regional Barometer (Cary Stacey and Jeff Frkonja, Metro)**

Cary Stacey and Jeff Frkonja provided information on the Regional Barometer, an online tool that publicly provides information on how the region is doing relative to Metro's six desired outcomes: transportation, economy, ecosystems, climate, communities and equity. It is part of a performance management system called By the Numbers, which will access and communicate how Metro programs support those outcomes. Regional Barometer users will be able to view easy-to-understand facts and figures with accompanying narratives; access links to supplemental information such as relevant strategies, research and reports; and download data for additional analysis.

The project purpose is to improve Metro decision-making through accountability, transparency and results.

- Increasing capacity of Metro's staff and supporting impactful work
- Increasing capacity of community-based organizations and community leaders to advocate for and target investments and services relative to their goals
- Building public trust and solidifying Metro's mandate
- Increasing data-driven policymaking region-wide
- Expanding regional data capacity and accessibility. Metro plans to convene regional partners for future strategic planning on this topic—please stay tuned for those conversations.

Ms. Stacey noted the project phases planned, beginning with the website launch by March 31, 2020. The tool is made public with existing datasets and strategic data plan. During phase 2, a proposed process will develop composite indicators, performance targets and benchmarks; conduct robust community engagement; and build out strategic data plan. The committee was shown the Regional Barometer website pages not yet available to the public for phase 1.

Comments from the committee:

- Jeff Owen asked how frequently the data is expected to change. Ms. Stacey and Mr. Frkonja reported the data received varied by source, but internal standards provide for quarterly updates of data. When asked how data included from Clark County was utilized, this was reported as part of the data tool that will have more long-term discussions with partnerships from the different agencies.

- Ramsey Weit asked if the data collection lines were maxed out (full) or available to take more data tied to strategic planning. Ms. Stacey reported there is capacity to add more data to the site and are open to input.
- Steve Williams asked if the documentation was planned beyond sources of data and calculation used for results. Agencies and jurisdictions might use similar approaches to analyze for measureable results and need specific data. It was noted more is being developed to fully document the data, but there are sometimes limitations to quotations from sources. It was acknowledged the data was downloadable.
- Carol Chesarek acknowledges the easy access to data with the tool. It was suggested that similar to what the City of Portland has, showing the percent of population to walking distance to parks would be useful. It was noted under environmental hazards only heat and flooding seems to be listed. It was suggested that data on landslides, earthquakes and wildfires be added to the list of hazardous situations.
- Eric Hesse asked if the agencies and jurisdictions will have opportunities to prioritize the data for future analysis and regional strategy. It was agreed that with downloadable data, frequent updates and further discussion on the importance of implementing relevant data this was possible.

#### **6. Regional Transportation Safety Discussion (Lake McTighe, Noel Mickelberry, Metro/ Kari Schlosshauer, Safe Routes to School Partnership)**

Lake McTighe, Noel Mickelberry and Kari Schlosshauer provided an update on traffic fatalities and serious injuries in the region, provided examples of regional activities focused on safety, an overview of Safe Routes to School Program activities and provided an opportunity for participants to discuss additional ways that Metro and the technical committees could highlight safety.

A Draft annual factsheet with data from 2018 was presented that show the trend for traffic fatalities and serious injuries trending upwards and indicate the region is not on track to meet Vision Zero goals. The Draft fact sheet included information on contributing factors. Consistent with previous years, speed and impairment were two of the leading factors in fatal and serious injury crashes in 2018. Aggressive behavior and failure to yield are also common causes. It was noted that there are typically several factors that contribute to crashes. Other factors not included in crash statistics, such as economic factors, roadway design, vehicle size and education also influence the number and severity of crashes.

Examples of Metro efforts underway and planned to address safety include:

- Safe Routes to School programs and policy committee
- Regional Transportation Plan: 132 safety projects and 551 projects with a safety benefit planned
- Regional funding prioritizing safety projects: RFFA – safety is key criterion, possible regional transportation investment measure - corridors and safe and livable streets programs
- Supporting new speed setting methods at ODOT
- Aligning Metro equity actions to safety actions

- Tracking progress: Monthly deadly crash updates at TPAC, annual fact sheet, annual update to JPACT, annual reports to ODOT and FHWA on targets, and safety data on Regional Barometer

Kari Schlosshauer provided information on Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs. Dedicated funds to SRTS were launched last year with over \$1 million from seven organizations, agencies and local jurisdictions. Through partnerships, every school district in the region now has a SRTS coordinator or dedicated district staff member for the program. In addition, a Policy Advisory Committee is being developed this year to discuss safe streets around schools.

A slide showing how other cities and countries were making progress was presented. Examples and best practices from these areas help Metro develop strategies for improving on safety issues locally. Tools from the new Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guide will be included in safety strategies. It was noted that many cities plan “heart zones” around schools, which are car-free zones for safety with school buses and drop-off/pick-ups for students. Adapting similar planning and aligning to infrastructure needs in our region’s planning efforts will be part of safety discussions.

Comments from the committee:

- Katherine Kelly appreciated the formation of the Safe Routes to School Policy Advisory Committee. Given the impact of individual names impacted with fatalities and serious crashes read each month at TPAC, it was suggested the same be provided to JPACT as well. MTAC could also receive this information, with the emphasis on individual people as more than a statistic.
- Ramsey Weit commented from the communication viewpoint these graphs and trends in data are not encouraging. It was suggested that stories to encourage better outcomes from strategies, steps taken that show what is making improvements, and evaluations that show results of steps taken with specific safety measures included in updates and presentations.
- Carol Chesarek noted that some of the graphs gave confusing data with recent data of fatalities going upward, while trends appear to go downward, partly used from previous (older) data. This could lend interpretation to more positive messages.
- Cole Grisham noted that the safety measures were useful. It was suggested that other programs outside SRTS, and outside Metro, could benefit on efforts with this data.

## 7. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at noon.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, February 19, 2020

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	02/19/2020	02/19/2020 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	021920M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	01/29/2020	MTAC Work Program, as of 01/29/2020	021920M-02
3	MTAC/TPAC Workshop Work Program	02/11/2020	MTAC/TPAC workshop Work Program, as of 02/11/2020	021920M-03
4	Minutes	01/15/2020	Meeting minutes from January 15, 2020 MTAC meeting	021920M-04
5	Memo	02/12/2020	TO: MTAC & TPAC members and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, Metro Project Manager and Laura Hanson, Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO) RE: Regional Emergency Transportation Routes (RETRs) Update	021920M-05
6	Handout	Winter 2020	Regional emergency transportation routes (RETR) update	021920M-06
7	Handout	02/11/2020	Regional emergency transportation routes update; Policy and Technical Discussions, 2020-2021	021920M-07
8	Memo	02/11/2020	TO: Laura Hanson, RDPO and Kim Ellis, Metro From: Thuy Tu, Thuy Tu Consulting, LLC/Allison Pyrch, Salus Resilience/Erica McCormick, Cascade GIS & Consulting, LLC RE: Process and Proposed Evaluation Framework for Updating the Regional Emergency Transportation Routes	021920M-08
9	Handout	1/30/2020	Performance management project; Regional Barometer	021920M-09
10	Handout	Feb. 2020	The Regional Barometer; Phase 1 Measures	021920M-10
11	Presentation	02/19/2020	Regional ETR Update Project	021920M-11
12	Presentation	02/19/20	Traffic deaths and serious injuries; update and discussion	021920M-12
13	Handout	Feb. 2020	Annual factsheet: Traffic deaths and serious injuries, 2018	021920M-13
14	Handout	Feb. 2020	Metro average annual safety targets and performance, 2014-2018	021920M-14