

# Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) workshop meeting**  
Date/time: Wednesday, August 17, 2022 | 9:00 a.m. to noon  
Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

---

**Members, Alternates Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Steve Williams  
Allison Boyd  
Sarah Paulus  
Chris Deffebach  
Lynda David  
Eric Hesse  
Peter Hurley  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Jay Higgins  
Don Odermott  
Tara O'Brien  
Glen Bolen  
Karen Williams  
Katherine Kelly  
Carol Chesarek  
Tom Armstrong  
Colin Cooper  
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich  
Jean Senechal Biggs  
Laura Terway  
Steve Koper  
Martha Fritzie  
Kevin Cook  
Theresa Cherniak  
Gary Albrecht  
Oliver Orjiako  
Laura Kelly  
Kelly Reid  
Shelly Parini  
Manuel Contreas, Jr.  
Heather Koch  
Nina Carlson  
Tom Bouillion  
Bret Marchant  
Brett Morgan  
Sara Wright  
Rachel Loftin  
Preston Korst  
Mike O'Brien

**Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
Southwest Washington Reg. Transportation Council  
City of Portland  
City of Portland  
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
City of Vancouver  
Multnomah County Citizen  
Largest City in the Region: Portland  
Largest City in Washington County: Hillsboro  
Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City  
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton  
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley  
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
Clark County  
Clark County  
OR Department of Land Conservation & Development  
OR Department of Land Conservation & Development  
Clackamas Water Environment Services  
Clackamas Water Environment Services  
North Clackamas Park & Recreation District  
Service Providers: Private Utilities, NW Natural  
Service Providers: Port of Portland  
Greater Portland, Inc.  
1000 Friends of Oregon  
Oregon Environmental Council  
Community Partners for Affordable Housing  
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland  
Green Infrastructure, Mayer/Reed, Inc.

**Members, Alternates Attending**

Craig Sheahan  
Brendon Haggerty

**Guests Attending**

Andrew Bastasch  
Avi Taylor  
Barbara Fryer  
Ben Chaney  
Bill Kabeiseman  
Brandy Steffen  
Bryan Pohl  
Darci Rudzinski  
Elin M-M  
Francesca Jones  
James Powell  
Jessica Pelz  
Julia Wean  
Katherine Bell  
Lidwien Rahman  
Lucia Ramirez  
Marc Farrar  
Miranda Bateschell  
Molly McCormick  
Neelam Dorman  
Nick Fortey  
Peter Schuyema  
Raymond Chong  
Riley Howard  
Samantha Thomas  
Steve Kelly  
Susie Wright  
Vanessa Vissar  
Will Farley

**Metro Staff Attending**

Tim Collins, Principal Transportation Planner  
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner  
Grace Stainback, Assoc. Transportation Planner  
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner  
Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner  
Bill Stein, Sr. Research & Modeler  
Clint Chivarini, Senior GIS Specialist  
Kadin Mangalik, Intern  
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner  
Matthew Flodin, Intern  
Roger Alfred, Metro Legal Counsel  
Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager  
Tim O'Brien, Principal Regional Planner

**Affiliate**

Green Infrastructure, David Evans & Associates  
Mult. County Public Health & Urban Forum

**Affiliate**

Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Cornelius  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
City of Forest Grove  
  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Washington County  
Steer  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
City of Wilsonville  
Kittelson & Associates  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
Home Builders Association of Portland  
Washington County  
Kittelson & Associates  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Lake Oswego

**Call meeting to order, introductions and committee updates** (Chair Kloster)

Chair Kloster called the workshop meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. The meeting format held in Zoom with chat area for shared links and comments, screen name editing, mute/unmute, and hands raised for being called on for questions/comments were among the logistics reviewed. Workshops will be held openly for all onscreen for full participation.

Chair Kloster posted in chat the following from the Department of Land Conservation & Development: Department of Land Conservation and Development staff have scheduled a webinar focused on the parking reforms in the Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities rules.

Parking Reform webinar will be held:

Tuesday, August 30

9 am - 10:30 am

<https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZYpc-GprzosE9VKPHTByiJsAf64JNKJPn3S>

Additional time for questions about CFEC rules includes DLCD office hours:

Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities Office Hours with DLCD Staff

Monday, September 12

2PM-3:30PM

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81792335713?pwd=Z09qNXlkUXUyTGNORmFCdFFhQ0lUdz09>

Additional guidance has been published and can be found at

<https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Pages/CFEC.aspx>

Don Odermott announced the new Cities of Washington County alternate member for TPAC; Mike McCarthy, Transportation Engineer, City of Tualatin.

Eric Hesse noted the additional office hours offered by DLCD regarding the CFEC rules. It was asked if Metro planned on offering time with staff on these issues. Chair Kloster noted Metro is looking to provided time with partners to answer questions and will report more on this soon.

Glen Bolen offered to be contacted by Metro interns for job positions at ODOT Region 1. Several positions are expected to be open soon. Those interested are encouraged to reach out to Mr. Bolen for further information.

**Comments from the Chair**

- 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Schedule of Discussion (Kim Ellis) It was noted the updated list of advisory committee and engagement meetings for the 2023 RTP schedule of discussions in the meeting packet. More changes are coming and will be sent to everyone as the list is updated again.
- 2022 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) JPACT and Metro Council Workshop Series (Kim Ellis) It was noted the RTP/JPACT/Metro Council workshop series schedule to support the RTP 2023 update was in the meeting packet. For questions on either schedules the committee can contact Ms. Ellis.

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** – none provided

**Consideration of MTAC/TPAC workshop summary of June 15, 2022** – Carol Chesarek suggested edits to wording on page 5 of the summary that Metro Counsel Roger Alfred could review and update. Consent with these edits, the committees approved the summary of June 15, 2022 MTAC/TPAC workshop.

**Metro/ODOT Regional Mobility Policy: Draft Recommendations** (Kim Ellis, Metro/ Glen Bolen, ODOT/ Susan Wright, Kittelson & Associates)

Ms. Ellis presented slides 1-5, which provided information on a review of the project purpose, a look back on development of the project, and project timeline. Ms. Wright presented slides 6-16, which provided information on the major changes and discussions since mid-June to address feedback, mobility policy elements, draft mobility policies for the Portland region, information on the regional mobility policy related to the RTP and Oregon Highway Plan Policy 1F, draft mobility policy performance measures, performance measure targets, system planning actions, and Metro 2040 Financially Constrained Travel Demand Model maps showing Household-based VMT per Capita and per Employee Data to Support Setting Baselines.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig asked for clarification on a sentence in the target column, slide 13, that reads “OAR 660 Division 44 (GHG Reduction Rule) set VMT/Capita reduction targets with which the **next** major RTP update and local TSPs will need to comply. Did this mean the 2027 or 2023 RTP? Ms. Ellis noted this was the 2023 RTP update. Things not completed or needing additional discussion with the timeline available would be identified in next steps of Chapter 8.

Information was shared on the maps shown regarding Travel Model Demand data, size & scope with geographic location from the model data.

- Karen Buehrig asked how the map inputs were used to calculate the data. Was the 2040 data with forecasted employees and population included in the TAZs with future year assumptions for zoning? When we use this information in the future will this be done by local jurisdictions or used by Metro modeling with special tools?
- Bill Stein noted he sees no reason why local jurisdictions cannot do the TMZs per capita given the data Metro can supply, however Metro is prohibited by law from releasing TMZ data to anyone who hasn't signed a confidential agreement. Ms. Ellis answered the first question by noting the data was based on travel analysis of the 2018 transportation plan. All assumptions and travel behavior data was included and will be updated for the Household-based VMT per Capita model in the 2023 RTP. Susie Wright added this is a simple output from model runs to start from. As we get to smaller plan amendment levels our action plan includes development of a spreadsheet tool that can help show increase or decrease in VMT per capita.
- Glen Bolen noted the spreadsheet are included with tools to come. The link to the University of Utah VMT spreadsheet tool was shared:  
<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/57719e085016e1776170a81c/t/57719e8e890b2719732dac81/1379542553096/MXDTripGenApp.pdf>  
Here's the spreadsheet for district level travel:  
[https://alex-steinberger-zhcx.squarespace.com/s/ET\\_MXD\\_Travel\\_App\\_Standalone\\_v320.xlsm](https://alex-steinberger-zhcx.squarespace.com/s/ET_MXD_Travel_App_Standalone_v320.xlsm)  
Here's a site level model with documentation on the EPA website  
<https://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/mixed-use-trip-generation-model>  
Here's a great manual from California that shows the math for a giant range of development related items and the effects on GHG: <https://www.airquality.org/residents/climate-change/ghg-handbook-caleemod>
- Jean Senechal Biggs noted the desire for more layers in the map to show 2040 growth plans and finer locations with employment and housing implications to transportations. Chair Kloster

noted the different perspectives on travel from the employment locations to travel in areas around the region for destinations.

- Don Odermott noted the amount of employees entering areas in TAZs from across the region. It was noted the Chips Act would soon be publicly announced from the statewide task force on microchips planned growth, with impacts on land use and transportation in the region. It was advised to have tools discussed that are implemented smartly and economically efficient.
- Mike O'Brien noted the VMP per capita seemed logical, but the per employees map seems more scattered. It was asked if the VMT was measured per day? Or by travel trips to/from home? Or with various destinations included with travel? Peter Hurley noted the model is for average weekdays in a given time range (example: 2 months), all home-based trips, modeling VMT per capita employment purposes. Susie Wright added this modeling does not capture deliveries or other driving patterns, but only commuter trips. Travel demand models are evolving to capture outside trips, but Metro currently uses only home-based trips. Mr. Hurley noted the figures in the document didn't seem to reflect the VMT, specifically figure 1 on page 42. Calculating demand need before estimating completion is recommended. Ms. Wright noted parallel models with the project that would both be updated as more information is obtained.
- Chris Deffebach noted that the 2040 growth plan and transportation planning were planned for regional centers to attract regional trips with connections to transit. Employment centers never rose to these goals to connect them to transit. Do we fail with planned amendments to these plans if not reaching the goals of the system completeness in this project? Ms. Wright noted the mobility policy update intends to bring a stronger transit and regional centers connection together. The amendments can help answer plans to projects in mixed use centers. Mitigation actions/plans may be next steps in adjusting against growing VMT or other factors.
- Don Odermott noted the difficulty meeting mobility goals if we don't have transit as a resource. While we strive to provide viable alternatives, we can't control where TriMet allocates the transit. It's difficult to grow regional centers, in the 2040 map, but not anchored by mass transit. It was noted smart strategies needed considering different affects from plans.

Ms. Wright continued the presentation with information on the average travel speed performance measure applying to system planning on throughways, average travel speed targets and hours per day targets. Average travel speed notes were presented. Findings from travel speed data research to support threshold setting was discussed.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked shouldn't 99W be on the throughway list - at least Tualatin to the south per RTP designation.
- Don Odermott asked why is I-5 from Columbia River to Marquam Bridge not on the list? And I didn't see I-405 on the list, whose congestion spills back onto US26. Why is US26 only considered for west of Sylvan? In reality, the I-405 and US26 congestion EAST of Sylvan cause queue spillbacks for many miles to the west on US26 (to 185th Ave frequently) but the Regional Travel Model is incapable of identifying the queuing impact of these well-established bottlenecks. This then becomes misleading as the Model dramatically overstates the speeds in the queue-impacted segments of the freeway.
- Carol Chesarek noted page 36 of the packet lists throughways in two bunches. One bunch has Hwy 26 from Sylvan to 405, the other bunch has Hwy 26 west of Sylvan. So it looks like both sections are included.

- Jean Senechal Biggs asked is it safe to assume that these patterns would follow the same during the academic year calendar? I'd be interested to hear thoughts on that.
- Steve Williams noted travel times of the day from the graphic shown, with S/N bound traffic and AM/PM readings offering different reliability targets. With this approach how can we account for shifts in time of day on different areas of regional freeway sections? Ms. Wright noted they are looking at both directions 24/hour periods. The travel speed is a metric to plan this system to look at what we want to achieve as our targets. The major bottleneck impacts will not be moved forward in this currently planned RTP. But what we can do is increase the miles on our freeway system for reliable flows for most hours of the day.
- Katherine Bell noted she would echo Stephen Williams' comment related to the speed graphics – I would be careful about using 2021-2022 data to inform policy related to interstate speeds. Traffic patterns on freeways are still in flux. I would suggest using pre-pandemic data. Otherwise, this methodology is great – very helpful and informative.
- Ben Chaney asked, following up on what Katie and Stephan mentioned: would both the policy and specifics of the speed/reliability targets be determined once and apply indefinitely? (like the v/c targets were). Or would the specifics (target speed and duration) be revisited with each RTP update based on field data etc.? It was noted they would be revisited at the end of the plan. Mr. Chaney noted it seems like the expectation that reliability speed targets will stick around for a while (esp. in the OHP) would support caution in using pandemic-influenced speed data in the target setting process.

Ms. Wright continued the presentation with Mobility Policy System Planning Actions, page 41 of the meeting packet. Discussion followed.

Comments from the committee:

- Don Odermott appreciated the presentation noting *Projections of VMT/capita must incorporate the best available science on latent and induced travel of additional roadway capacity*. In the chart showing N. Bound on I-20 the time periods showing lowest speeds would equate to increase of emissions in these higher outputs. A map of 2015 base year from the 2018 RTP was shown, noting this did not reflect the congestion we now have. Ms. Ellis noted this is not a direct output of the travel model, but an analysis of how the travel model is meeting or not our policy. For accurate forecasting and modeling with data, the policy update will be best served with smart designs with tools.
- Eric Hesse Would like the PMT to confirm my understanding of the proposed use of the speed "targets" vs "standards". It appears this is a more operational assessment. A better understanding of the implications with shifts would be helpful. It would be beneficial to have a balance and connection between travel and land use planning. Right now it feels like how the freeway performs, but would be interested in knowing how these interact with land, housing and transportation project plans, and what the implications on the target setting would be.
- Sara Wright agreed on the prioritizations placed for clarity on implications. It was asked if there was a way to measure variability of travel time rather than speed. Travel speed itself is inherently valuable, but the variability of travel time is what is important to people and business for trip measurements. Susie Wright noted the data shows some variability of travel time. The question is how many hours are useable for reliability. Future predictions for reliability is difficult. The number one factor is recurring congestion that can provide data on travel time and address planning for better reliability.

Ms. Wright continued the presentation with information on system completeness targets, completeness elements, defining these elements in the planning system, specifics on TSMO and TDM System Completeness, the system planning process utilizing the mobility policy measures, and the Metro area planning cycle.

Comments from the committee:

- Mike O'Brien noted the graphics shown from the previous section were dated July 2022. It was advised to collect data not during summer when school is out on arterials and streets that might give false information year round. It as noted the last 2 ½ years had affects to planning that are not known if repeating or changing significantly with new data. The last data collected from this recent time may be suspect.
- Karen Buehrig asked for clarification on the planned amendment of the proportional share that identifies needs that will be established based on daily trips described in figure 2. How would the proportional share be used. Is it a dollar amount or for certain projects? Ms. Wright noted the planned amendments are targeted to increasing the VMT per capita and looking at non-financially constrained planned projects. It looks at the gaps in the system and how to identify these for proportional shares against the planned amendment phase. Asked if these projects need to be constructed before the planned amendment is approved, Glen Bolen noted the length of project time for completion with various planning changes and amendments possible, so no requirement of construction before the planned amendment.
- Eric Hesse asked for clarification between speed targets vs standards. When discussing freeway performance thresholds these have implications on highway expansion discussions, or land use limitations over proposed development nearby. Are we proposing a pivot or are we setting a speed target? What are the implications of this? Ms. Ellis noted more follow up on this since the issue is complex. Mr. Bolen noted the difference between identifying a need and choosing a project. These targets can help us figure out where deficiencies are with costs, benefits and more to projects.

Ms. Wright continued the presentation with information on plan amendment evaluation actions, the plan amendment process utilizing the mobility policy measures, and guidance for assessing the plan amendment with impacts to system completeness. The implementation action plan was described with Policy Implementation Actions, Near-term Data and Guidance Actions, and Long-term Data and Analysis Tool Actions.

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse noted the system completeness with step 6, referencing *"In system plans, when identifying transportation needs and prioritizing investments and strategies, projects that create greater equity and reduce disparities between "Equity Focus Areas" and "Non-Equity Focus Areas" shall be prioritized."* More understanding of this with correct prioritization for safety would be appreciated. Asked if TDM guidance is still forthcoming, Ms. Ellis noted the TDM from ODOT is being studied. The link was shared in chat: TGM Guidance on TDM Plans in TSPs: [https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/Publications/TDMPlans\\_for\\_Development\\_2013.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/Publications/TDMPlans_for_Development_2013.pdf) More updating on the Equitable Climate Friendly Rulemaking will be incorporated in plans as well. Further discussion on Regional Mobility Policy will take place at committees this fall, with planned ask for recommendation from TPAC to JPACT in November.
- Peter Hurley agreed with more details from the tables. Local agencies can't understand what the implications for our systems are with reliability and travel time. It was encouraged the

team spend significantly more time on the system completeness to see results from outcomes on load share and productivity, and the linkage to outcomes.

- Steve Williams noted the modeling could show the greater the change (increase) in trips, the further out the impacts are going to reach. Small changes likely show between short distances. Large trip generations will result in impacts from greater distances in the system. It was questioned if the mobility policy as proposed deals with this distance equation or set radius for distance measurement.
- Don Odermott asked if the document defines what is a complete transit for system completeness. He agreed that with the complete system by the end of the planning period it is critical to understanding the deliveries with scarcity of public funds, and how agencies must maintain the ability to be nimble with how they meet objectives.
- Ben Chaney asked, that due to the pandemic data in the process, regarding speed targets, would these be embedded into the policy indefinitely or an element that would be written for the RTP update. Ms. Ellis noted speed targets have been in place in the RTP many years. It was not anticipated that this will be revisited soon. However, an analysis of current conditions to help identify changes can always be considered. The current policy is an interim policy from 20 years ago, showing ongoing work yet to be done.
- Chris Deffebach noted my question relates to footnote 7 of Table 3 - Is this related to ECO rule update? We haven't had any discussion of ECO rule at TPAC - yet this seems to imply the jurisdictions will have a new role - a good topic for the future - before we commit to it in these new standards. It was asked if we are developing policy that says we want a certain kind of service. Ms. Ellis noted chapter 3 of the RTP in our plan, then we'll see what projects of the plan we can afford. Asked on completeness, does that need to be in the financially constrained plan or not? Ms. Ellis noted they are still working through this issue.

**River Terrace 2.0 Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) exchange status update** (Ted Reid, Tim O'Brien & Clint Chiavarini, Metro) Ted Reid began the presentation with information on the City of Tigard's proposed well-planned UGB expansion under Metro's new mid-cycle UGB amendment process. Metro has recommended approval of this expansion, but through a UGB exchange instead of the mid-cycle process. It would entail adding the River Terrace 2.0 area to the UGB and removing a comparable amount of buildable land elsewhere in the region. This approach is consistent with Metro's focus on city readiness in its growth management decisions.

Metro staff is following a two-step process for determining areas to consider for the UGB exchange. Clint Chiavarini presented information on the first step GIS analysis to identify preliminary exchange candidates and the second step as consultation with local jurisdictions, service districts, and other stakeholders about the planning and development status of exchange candidates to focus on those areas that have not demonstrated a path towards readiness.

GIS analysis approach:

1. Land must be inside and adjacent to the existing UGB. No islands within the UGB should be created.
2. Acreage can be from a single contiguous area or multiple contiguous areas can be removed to total of approximately 350 buildable acres, however, these should be fairly large (100 acres or more).
3. Acreage should be from unincorporated areas of the UGB, not land currently in an existing city limits.

Tim O'Brien presented information on areas identified for further consultation and discussion. Areas identified as "no longer under consideration" reflect Metro staff's current understanding of planning and development status, sometimes as a result of preliminary consultations with local jurisdictions. The memo in the packet summary of staff's reasoning for these area considerations (identified by number on the map shown).

### **Areas No Longer Under Consideration**

- 1 – Forest Grove: David Hill and South of Purdin Road
- 2 – North Hillsboro
- 4 – South Hillsboro
- 5 – Sherwood and Tualatin: Tonquin/Southwest Tualatin
- 6 – Tualatin and Wilsonville: Basalt Creek/Coffee Creek

### **Areas for Further Discussion**

- 7 – Oregon City: South End
- 8 – Oregon City: Beaver Creek Road
- 9 – Oregon City: Park Place
- 10 – Damascus
- 11 – Gresham: Springwater
- 3 – Multnomah County: West Hayden Island

Comments from the committee:

- Colin Cooper noted readiness is a function of a lot of things. Case in point, Hillsboro conducted a report on readiness some years ago and it took an average of 6 years between the time Metro makes a decision and approves UGB expansion to when development begins with construction. Elements of readiness is complex.
- Laura Terway complimented the work of Metro staff and coordination with jurisdictions on making these arrangements.
- Tom Bouillion asked why West Hayden Island was listed to come out of the UGB with this expansion consideration. It was asked why the process is being pursued as exchange instead of the mid-cycle amendment. It was questioned that with this area part of the UG Report with buildable land inventory, Hayden Island has 0 capacity buildable land for residential purposes. From a policy context, even if a good idea to trade industrial for residential land, the characteristics between the two are different with different accommodation needs.

Mr. Reid agreed the City of Tigard originally proposed this expansion as a mid-cycle amendment. This is Metro's first time soliciting proposals from cities with the UGB exchange process responding to immediate opportunities for UGB expansions for residential uses. Metro Council decided to proactively problem solve for constructive space given housing shortages.

In regard to the 2018 buildable land inventory question, Metro's employment inventory identified buildable land on West Hayden Island. It acknowledges it was added for Marine Industrial uses but now currently in conceptual planning and not progressed to Urban Zoning. The need for more industrial land is a priority in the region and something we need to discuss further.

- Karen Buehrig was interested in the next steps with engaging property owners and next steps with local jurisdictions that may be impacted. Where and how are the local property owners engaged? Mr. Reid noted there is not a lot of guidance about how we are to conduct this process. But Metro has started to begin a narrow the scope first before first steps with outreach, then will get to the start of concrete options to discuss in a meaningful way. Meetings with CPOs and jurisdictions will allow Metro to hear from property owners about their interest in the process. Ms. Buehrig asked that Counties be kept in the loop of the outreach being done with the various CPO's and future hearing processes, too. Mr. Reid agreed.
- Aquilla Hurd-Ravich noted the Oregon City recently adopted housing needs analysis, and some of the areas we predicted for capacity are in some areas that may come out of the UGB. A question for the next round of discussion is what are the consequences of land that comes out of the UGB identified in the housing needs analysis.
- Kevin Cook asked if an area is removed from the UGB, what is the status of that area with respect to Urban and Rural Reserves? Undesignated? Roger Alfred noted we are in the process of analyzing that issue, and it might vary depending on specific locations - initial thought is that it more likely would need to be urban.
- Tom Armstrong noted possible consideration of the OHNA under build analysis and incorporate into regional housing needs analysis to identify additional housing need for mid cycle adjustment.

Mr. Reid concluded the presentation with a list of next meeting dates with MTAC making a recommendation on exchange land options at their Sept. 21 meeting.

**Adjournment** (Chair Kloster)

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

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, August 17, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	8/17/2022	8/17/2022 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	081722M-01
2	Work Program	8/10/2022	MTAC work program as of 8/10/2022	081722M-02
3	Work Program	8/10/2022	TPAC work program as of 8/10/2022	081722M-03
4	Handout	08/04/2022	2023 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN Project Timeline and 2022 Discussions and Engagement Activities	081722M-04
5	Handout	7/21/2022	2023 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN JPACT and Metro Council Workshop Series	081722M-05
6	Draft Minutes	6/15/2022	Draft minutes from June 15, 2022 MTAC TPAC workshop	081722M-06
7	Memo	8/10/2022	TO: TPAC and MTAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, Metro Project Manager Lidwien Rahman, ODOT Project Manager Glen Bolen, ODOT Region 1 RE: Regional Mobility Policy Update: Revised Draft Policy, Measures and Action Plan	081722M-07
8	Attachment 1	8/10/2022	Memo RE: Task 8.1: Updated "Discussion Draft" Mobility Policy (8/10/22)	081722M-08
9	Attachment 2	N/A	Maps of 2040 FC VMT Per Capita Portland Metro Area	081722M-09
10	Attachment 3	8/9/2022	Sample Throughway Travel Speed Data	081722M-10
11	Attachment 4	8/3/2022	REGIONAL MOBILITY POLICY UPDATE PROJECT TIMELINE AND 2022 ENGAGEMENT SCHEDULE	081722M-11
12	Memo	8/10/2022	TO: MTAC, TPAC and Interested Parties From: Clint Chiavarini, Tim O'Brien, and Ted Reid: Metro Planning, Development and Research RE: River Terrace 2.0 UGB exchange: preliminary UGB exchange options	081722M-12
13	Presentation	8/17/2022	Regional mobility policy update	081722M-13
14	Presentation	08/17/2022	Tigard UGB Exchange	081722M-14