

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) and Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) workshop meeting**
 Date/time: Wednesday, February 15, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to noon
 Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

Members, Alternates Attending

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair, TPAC
 Eryn Kehe, Chair, MTAC
 Karen Buehrig
 Allison Boyd
 Sarah Paulus
 Lynda David
 Eric Hesse
 Mark Lear
 Jaimie Lorenzini
 Dayna Webb
 Jay Higgins
 Mike McCarthy
 Tara O'Brien
 Neelam Dorman
 Glen Bolen
 Karen Williams
 Carol Chesarek
 Tom Armstrong
 Colin Cooper
 Aquilla Hurd-Ravich
 Laura Terway
 Steve Koper
 Katherine Kelly
 Jamie Stasny
 Adam Barber
 Chris Deffebach
 Kelly Reid
 Manuel Contreas, Jr.
 Heather Koch
 Cindy Detchon
 Fiona Lyon
 Jerry Johnson
 Bret Marchant
 Aaron Golub
 Jacqui Treiger
 Rachel Loftin
 Preston Korst
 Erik Cole
 Mike O'Brien
 Andrea Hamberg
 Brendon Haggerty

Affiliate

Metro
 Metro
 Clackamas County
 Multnomah County
 Multnomah County
 SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
 City of Portland
 City of Portland
 City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
 City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
 City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
 City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
 TriMet
 Oregon Department of Transportation
 Oregon Department of Transportation
 Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
 Multnomah County Representative, MTAC
 Largest City in the Region: Portland
 Largest City in Washington County: Hillsboro
 Second Largest City in Clackamas County: Oregon City
 Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley
 Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin
 City of Vancouver
 Clackamas County
 Multnomah County
 Washington County
 OR Department of Land Conservation & Development
 Clackamas Water Environment Services
 North Clackamas Park & Recreation District
 North Clackamas School District
 TriMet
 Johnson Economics, LLC
 Greater Portland, Inc.
 Portland State University
 Oregon Environmental Council
 Community Partners for Affordable Housing
 Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
 Revitalize Portland Coalition, Schnitzer Properties
 Green Infrastructure, Mayer/Reed, Inc.
 Mult. County Public Health & Urban Forum
 Mult. County Public Health & Urban Forum

Members, Alternates Attending

Ryan Ames

Affiliate

Washington County Public Health & Urban Forum

Guests Attending

Barbara Fryer
Brian Hurley
Bryan Graveline
Chris Smith
Cody Meyer
Danielle Maillard
Dave Roth
Elin Michel-Midelfort
Indi Namkoong
Jairaj Singh
Jasia Mosley
Jessica Pelz
Jonathan Slason
Joy Change
Katie Mangle
Katie Selin
Ken Rencher
Lewis Kelly
Marc Farrar
Max Nonnamaker
Michah Meskel
Miranda Bateschell
Reid Haefer
Sarah Iannarone
Schuyler Warren
Susie Wright
Suzanne Savin
One phone caller

Affiliate

City of Cornelius
Oregon Department of Transportation
Portland Bureau of Transportation

Oregon Depart. of Land Conservation & Development
Oregon Walks
City of Tigard

Verde
Multnomah County Environmental Health

Washington County
RSG
City of Sherwood
Alta Planning & Design
Alta Planning & Design

Oregon Department of Transportation
Metropolitan Land Group
Multnomah County
Portland Audubon Society
City of Wilsonville
RSG
The Street Trust
City of Tigard
Kittelson & Associates
Washington County

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Andrea Pastor, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Daniel Audelo, Eliot Rose, Glen Hamburg, Grace Cho, Grace Stainback, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Noel Mickelberry, Ted Reid, Thaya Patton, Tim Collins

Call meeting to order, introductions and committee updates (Vice Chair, Ted Leybold, TPAC)

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair TPAC, 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. No committee updates given.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none provided

Consideration of MTAC/TPAC workshop summary of October 19, 2022 – No edits or corrections were submitted; summary of October 19, 2022 workshop approved.

Metro School Walkshed Map & Regional Transportation Plan Crash Summary Map Demos (Noel Mickelberry & Matthew Hampton, Metro) Noel Mickelberry introduced development work done for the 2023 School Walkshed. Work included development of network datasets, updated data analysis, and creating an interactive map tool for partners to easily view individual school and district data. Matthew Hampton explained that walksheds are built using a Network Dataset, shown in the presentation on maps.

Updated methodology and new variables have been added to reflect equity and safety factors. Ms. Mickelberry noted that each school received a quintile score for each variable. These were presented by radar chart and a new interactive map that was demonstrated.

<https://gis.oregonmetro.gov/schoolwalksheds/>

Mr. Hampton presented information on Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Fatal and Serious Crashes from ODOT data (2016-2020). The maps shown had data on fatal and serious crashes for those on bicycles and walking. <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/f9cdb4b5c12d4574aeb7ebc4fbf56915> there's also a shortened URL at <https://tinyurl/rtpcrashes>

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked is there any factor for size of school population? How will this data be used? Is it part of the RFFA Safe Routes to Schools? Ms. Mickelberry noted ODOT grants are used for infrastructure at schools, which include similar criteria for the tool developed. Populations vary with high schools tending to be larger, elementary schools smaller. It might be possible to compare types of pools with the data. The data will be used as a tool for partners applying for Metro grants that can help with school programming.
- Colin Cooper asked if the overall scores were used in funding priorities for projects. Ms. Mickelberry noted the scores were not used in any prioritization of funding but used for informational purposes.
- Michael O'Brien noted It would be very interesting to apply this tool to parks and green spaces.
- Cindy Detchon noted school district requirements from ODE is 1-mile or 1.5 mile radius walkzone that includes safety, terrains, known criminal activity and other factors not seen within the data sets. ODE's collection of schools demographics is based on our student information systems. Ms. Mickelberry noted the focus of this project was on transportation and safety but it would welcome to have further information for better understanding to include with planning walkzones and bridge any gaps in data between Metro and the school districts.
- Adam Barber asked about seeing a SE/NW alignment when all the regional walksheds were turn on, and interpreting this to mean it would be easier to walk in these directions. Matthew Hampton noted this shown just in the way the walksheds were drawn in a layered way and would check into this.
- Glen Bolen asked if areas with infrastructure involved could be replicated with other data to see where collations are possible. Ms. Mickelberry noted site work with bike infrastructure helps on scores but it is not the only element. Availability for schools and teachers to provide access and safety helps to find what is needed and make this happen.
- Manuel Contreras asked regarding the school walkshed map is the data coming from the school districts or other independent sources. Ms. Mickelberry noted all the data comes from ODE (Oregon Department of Education).

2023 Climate Smart Analysis: estimating the Greenhouse Gas Reduction gap (Kim Ellis & Eliot Rose, Metro) The presentation began with an overview detailing how our regional climate targets and the Climate Smart strategy work, providing an initial estimate of the gap in greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions that we need to close in the 2023 RTP update in order to meet our targets, and how we will refine this initial estimate as we update it to reflect the RTP Call for Projects.

Kim Ellis reminded the committees that these “GHG reduction targets” are in effect vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction targets. Our region is expected to meet GHG targets by reducing VMT. Targets reflect the need to reduce GHG reductions beyond what state and federal clean vehicle/fuel policies and investments can achieve. We can only count actions to promote clean vehicles/fuels if they are locally funded. Targets apply to household-based emissions from light-duty vehicles. (In other words, freight trips don’t count.) Targets are based on 2005 baseline emissions.

Eliot Rose described how updating the Climate Smart analysis worked. This is a combination of Local/regional transportation/land use plans and investments (RTP), and assumptions about State vehicle/fuel programs and policies (STS). The 2014 Climate Smart Strategy reduced 2035 emissions by 29% (vs. a 20% target) based on then-current state, regional, and local plans to implement GHG reduction strategies. We update the analysis each RTP cycle to review our progress and reflect changes to those plans.

The Climate Smart analysis update process shown:

1. Review Climate Smart policies and priorities assumed in 2018 RTP and progress/what’s changed (done)
2. Consult with State on background assumptions and methodology (ongoing)
3. Share the initial estimate of the GHG emissions reduction gap that the 2023 RTP needs to close to meet the target for 2045 (today)
4. Update the initial estimate to reflect the 2023 call for projects (March-April)
5. Identify further changes as needed to address any remaining gap (April-May)

Current policy priorities and updates were presented:

- Increasing transit service remains a high-priority strategy.
- There are both strong hopes and concerns regarding congestion pricing.
- Local implementation of CFEC may expand the use of parking pricing.
- The region should rely on a mix of strategies to meet its GHG reduction targets.
- The analysis should account for teleworking and other changes to travel patterns.
- Land use has a significant impact on GHG emissions – this will be the focus of the 2040 Growth Concept update, not the RTP.

Initial gap estimate was described. The **Target scenario** shows the region’s VMT reduction target. The **STS+RTP18 scenario** shows the VMT reductions due to adopted State and local/regional plans.

- State agencies developed the **STS assumptions** to reflect the Statewide Transportation Strategy. They describe vehicle and fuel mix and cost.
- Metro staff and consultants developed the **RTP18 inputs** to reflect implementation of the 2018 RTP out to 2050.

The **RTP23 gap** is estimated gap between the Target and STS+RTP18 scenarios for the year 2045. We will update this estimate to reflect the Call for Projects. We expect these estimates to change as we adjust them to reflect reduced transit service and ridership, increased teleworking, implementation of

road pricing and questions about how to account for it, and the potential increase in parking due to new CFEC rules. We may have questions about how these changes should be reflected in the final climate analysis.

The Climate Smart analysis update timeline was presented through June, when the release of the draft final climate analysis as part of the public comment draft of the 2023 RTP update is scheduled.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig appreciated the detailed information. It was noted in the materials that land use as part of the growth concept update was important. Pricing is an important tool that we would be using and applying in this RTP. And pricing is effective if providing good transit. The pricing we are trying to do is mode shift but in order to have successful transit we need to have the land uses that are appropriate to support the transit. It is important to not be disconnected from land use work because we need to have the right land uses in order to make these strategies work.

It was noted that RTP 2023 gaps in projects were similar to those from Clackamas County. Not many new projects from Clackamas County are planned for the 2023 RTP, so the process talked about in the scenarios is important in which to close the gap. Regarding scenarios, in the initial work of the mobility policy we discussed VMT. VMT is the greatest in the subregions away from the center of the region. It was suggested to have a scenario that applies to transit service in farther out areas to address VMT, if trying to reduce VMT with strategies with most need.

In the materials is stated “Before finalizing the RTP, Metro needs to further review the assumptions behind the climate analysis to understand the assumed division of responsibilities between State and local/regional transportation agencies in implementing pricing, understand how to account for locally funded clean vehicle/fuel strategies, and ensure that the analysis accounts for the increase in teleworking and online shopping and potentially for other recent changes to travel behavior. As Metro and its partners review and update the regional climate analysis, they need to pay close attention to updating the level of implementation of particular strategies that are either priorities for JPACT and Metro Council or are the focus of new state/regional policies that create new opportunities for implementation, including parking and road pricing.” It was asked to share what the expectations were to pricing and expected additional work going to be done to understand the impacts of pricing and how best to spend these revenues.

Mr. Rose noted that to respect to land use the RTP always accounts for the land use vision that is outlined in the 2040 growth concept and accounts for how we are building projects in the RTP to interact with land use processes and projected growth and development. What is doesn't do in the 2023 RTP (but will do in the 2040 update) is look at changing that vision overall to better achieve climate targets. Updating the vision provides better reductions in GHG emissions.

Regarding the transit scenario with shift to where more investment occurs, it was noted that any scenarios we look at needs to be consistent with the constrained RTP investments. There is limited time to adopt the RTP and limited amount of resources to invest in the region. We need to look at scenarios that fit within these constraints in order to keep on the critical path.

To respect to pricing, Metro is still working with ODOT to develop the basic information that will be included in the RTP around which facilities will be priced, how much priced and how revenues will be invested. We expect to better understand how revenues are impacting travel behavior. Ms. Ellis added this will continue to evolve. The statewide pricing strategy still has pricing assumptions that is part of the coordination work. More is being discussed on what pertains and applies to the RTP.

- Jerry Johnson asked does the national average represent urban areas? It seems like the shift to remote work had the most significant impact on the timeline. Is that a pattern we will or should be encouraging, and do changing commute patterns factor into the model? Ms. Ellis noted It is important to note that “urban areas” nationally are a bit different than our urban area since we have a UGB. Here is a link to data Metro monitors:
<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/transportation-system-monitoring-daily-vehicle-miles-travel>

It was asked if we have any data on transit usage rates and patterns since 2020? I am interested in the impact of shifting commute patterns on transit utilization. Ms. Ellis noted we use the regionally coordinated growth distribution that is based on local plans and 2040 growth concept implementation locally. That was adopted by the Metro Council, reflecting the 2018 growth management decision. Tara O’Brien added here is the evaluation that TriMet conducted on transit trends since 2020. This is what we used to help redesign future bus service which will be implemented through Forward Together, beginning this year. These changes will be incorporated into Metro's near term Transit Network map.
<https://trimet.org/forward/#background>

- Andrea Hamberg noted that past analysis of active transportation shows the importance increasing physical activity, a way to achieve reduced GHG emissions and a key strategy for changes in transit. It was suggested to show active travel more prominently as part of this strategy. It was asked what is planned with changes around ebikes and how this fits in strategies. From the scenario standpoint interest was shown in land use with active transportation that go beyond infrastructure. More information was asked about tools to analyze changes with active transportation.

Ms. Ellis noted these were important factors with the Climate Smart strategies and have limited resources with tools until the “tool kit” is built forward. Jonathan Slason with RSG noted that ebikes can be accounted for with assumptions on travel lengths, such as over five miles. The shift from a regular bike to an ebike carries assumptions with variables and changes that can put into modeling. It can be developed and be explicit with data for the RTP. Mr. Rose added active transportation is a critical part of the Climate Smart strategy with more discussions on them in the future.

- Heather Koch added parks agencies also are interested in the active transportation piece as park systems contribute to the trail network and support of ebikes to support GHG reductions via reduced VMT. Are there Active Transportation targets in the RTP list formation? Since counties are now coordinating the finalization of lists and projects to be uploaded, I'm unclear if there is any goal or threshold in those RTP lists of projects that will be eligible for federal funding, and whether there is a lever there to ensure that projects on that list support active transportation to any degree/threshold.

- Karen Williams asked of the importance of including assumptions about other protection program strategies besides clean fuels. Was it important to dig deeper or because they are state programs with assumptions about GHG reductions they are not relevant to these strategies? Mr. Rose noted our state agencies have the ultimate strategies for reaching our targets. ODOT gives us the set of assumptions in the STS. It might be worth having coordination between state agencies.
- Michael O'Brien noted strategies with tolling and parking rely on individual outlays of funding. How are factors of naturally challenged households being analyzed and plan to be used in relation to those that are challenged. Mr. Rose noted pricing comes into the RTP though ODOT's Regional Mobility Policy Project, and the other facilities ODOT is planning to price is planning in the area that is part of the programs' developing considerations on how to address these issues with low-income households. Glen Bolen added the legislative directive includes language about this, and the committee EMAC was formed to address the issues.
- Chris Deffebach noted on page 17 of the memo in the packet "**STS+RTP18 Scenario** (STS state inputs + 2018 Regional Adopted Plans). The scenario is a specific analysis that assumes the state and federal actions are occurring as expected (per the assumptions in the target rule) to evaluate the impact of the current trajectory of regional actions on per capita VMT reductions. The analysis suggests a gap of 1.8 DVMT per capita to be addressed by regional policies by 2050. The gap is the different of the STS+RTP18 scenario achieving a 26% point reduction in per capita DVMT relative to the target of 35%, leaving a 9% point gap."

With 2 miles reduction in VTM for every household, where are these households located, what tools will reflect these changes, what affect comes from home deliveries and online ordering, what do we need to address these and make the targets set, and if targets are not met, what options do we have with possible state support to the regional level? Mr. Rose noted as the analysis is refined the gaps may close or open. A mix of elements will help us reach our targets. Results in better ridership from service changes is being shown from TriMet. The significance of pricing to reduce GHG emissions will be shown in teleworking but less impact expected from home deliveries. It's too early to know if the gap goes up or down and where we are to our targets. The 2050 target in the memo should be noted for the next RTP update. For the current update the 2045 target is used.

Jonathan Slason noted the 1 mile per capita is correct. This is an average across the entire Metro region which means some individuals would have a substantially larger reduction and some households would have a smaller reduction. Some of the methods with tools to help us identify approaches come geographically, households of certain income, size of household and type of vehicle used. The surgical approach will come when more is known after Call for Projects in the April/May timeline. It was noted that adjacent areas to counties may affect targets. Further analysis can report on these possible changes.

- Mike McCarthy agreed with comments of feeling the traffic coming in from outside the region. It was asked how the model accounted for these trips. Mr. Rose referred to the comment in chat from Cody Meyer (DLCD); Targets don't count households coming into your region. Mr. Rose added what our targets do or do not apply to, and if they are not counting these households, that's the way our targets are constructed. Thaya Patton (Metro) added the tool we are using for this analysis has been developed by the state which is a household based tool. Our targets are written for household DVMT.

It was asked what the goal is; are we trying to meet the targets or are we trying to reduce GHG. Mr. Rose noted this is a process designed by states to make sure we work together. Specific responsibilities to reach reductions in GHG is the work to be done collectively towards reaching climate smart goals. Mr. McCarthy noted agreed that the greatest potential for greenhouse gas reduction is out of the suburbs, in particular in areas of new development but unfortunately with no option for transit. It was felt vehicle hours traveled was a better proxy for the GHG emissions with fuel consumption. Fleet changes to electric vehicles combined with all the strategies for VMT reductions would result in double the reductions. Shifts from traffic divergencies will shift to local roads with less walkability and safety.

- Eric Hesse asked for clarification on the timeline and process. It was asked if the assumption questions raised would be part of the discussion at the March 8 TPAC workshop, or come back in April as part of the analytic presentation. It was noted that on page four of the memo Metro's process for updating the Climate Smart analysis in the 2023 RTP to meet the updated targets set by the State were laid out in steps. Assumptions on fleet reductions were not listed. Mr. Rose noted they were not able to update all of the RTP related inputs into the Climate Strategy until the Call for Projects would be completed and most not known until April. This discussion and future discussions will help advance earliest consideration for adjustments.
- Glen Bolen hopes we are looking at what is happening with the CFEC rule changes as applied to land use changes. They are unlocking the development potential in areas of centers that have transit, walkability, and mobility access. Mr. Rose encouraged more local partners to share how they plan to implement CFEC rules in their plans which is useful information.
- Colin Cooper noted the challenges with changes and slow progress to update zoning and regulation standards but remains optimistic that details can be worked out.
- Jamie Stasny noted in chat ODOT sent this out yesterday. They are asserting that the Oregon Toll Program is not a "Program Affecting Land Use."
<https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/ORDOT/bulletins/348d734>

Workshop break for five minutes

Workshop resumed with MTAC Chair, Eryn Kehe

Draft work program for the 2024 urban growth management decision (Ted Reid, Metro) The presentation began with background of the requirement under state law to adopt – by the end of 2024 – an assessment of the region's capacity to accommodate the next twenty years of housing and job growth inside the urban growth boundary (UGB). Metro seeks to improve its growth management practices every time it undertakes this cyclical process. Metro will continue its emphasis on land readiness to ensure that decisions emphasize the governance, market, and infrastructure conditions that must be present to produce housing and jobs. This process will differ from past decisions by applying a greater focus on the housing needs of all income groups, particularly households with lower incomes. This focus on affordability advances shared goals of increasing housing production for those that have the fewest choices.

Elements noted in the Urban Growth Report were employment:

- Regional employment forecast
- Assessment of trends like work from home, etc.
- Employment site inventory
- Industrial land readiness

Housing:

- Population and household forecast
- Development trends:
 - Price, type, size, rent/own
 - Redevelopment, infill, vacant lands
- Displacement trends
- Housing needs analysis

New in the 2024 Urban Growth Report is a development proforma approach for assessing growth capacity, including middle housing estimates, housing needs by income group, existing and future housing needs, and consideration of economic aspirations and forecasts. Committees, groups, stakeholders, public and technical groups will have several opportunities to weigh in before late summer 2024 when Metro Council COO makes a recommendation. The 2024 growth management decision timeline overview was provided, including the noted Dec 1, 2023 date for letters of interest from cities that intend to propose UGB expansions.

Comments from the committee:

- Colin Cooper noted guidance used in the past for jurisdictions interested in proposing expansions. It was suggested to use these again. Mr. Reid agreed they can be sent out to cities and counties with the codes needed to be addressed.
- Barbara Fryer asked if this was a potential pathway for Cornelius to get more land added for the UGB or if constrained by the Grand Bargain (referring to HB-748). Mr. Reid noted this process is intended for cities to propose expansions to acknowledge urban reserves. What were previous urban reserves were added to the City of Cornelius out of the UGB in the Grand Bargain. Metro Council is not able to expand the UGB in urban reserves that surround Cornelius.
- Andrea Hamberg asked what the process is for filling seats on the advisory committee. Mr. Reid noted this is just a conceptual plan at the moment. Work is still being developed on what types of expertise should be included. More direction will come from Metro Council on this soon.
- Preston Korst added that builders/developers should be added to those conversations as well.
- Chris Deffebach noted the challenges with planning this cycle from middle housing and new existing needs for housing in the region. It was suggested to have cities and counties engaged that have staff working on development, permits, forecasting, planning and fact checking in models. Technical staff from cities and counties could provide a huge knowledge base that could be reported at MTAC meetings. It was suggested to include asking what input is needed from the committee in next steps from MTAC. The idea of youth involvement was encouraged. It was noted of the importance to have this participation for discussion of future growth management decisions.
- Colin Cooper asked how growth in Vancouver impacts this urban growth management decision. Mr. Reid noted we start with our 7 county forecast that includes part of Southern Washington State. We have to estimate factors such as how much growth will go to Clark County, which becomes a blend of technical and policies issues. It was noted that Clark County was growing faster than the counties in the Metro region. With the work intended to inform the 2040 Growth Concept Update, and with the decision by Council to have a boundary type perspective rather than satellite city perspective, it was asked how we are making sure we are identifying climate smart strategies as significant growth is happening around satellite communities while able to follow our desired outcomes and goals for reducing GHG, VMT and smart housing

decisions. Mr. Reid noted the region needs to produce more housing, and to the extent there are cities in the region that can propose expansion in the urban reserves.

- Katherine Kelly noted thanks for pointing out the need to effectively capture SW WA growth- especially in City of Vancouver.
- Glen Bolen noted to Colin's point, the Census is now saying that places such as Hubbard and Aurora are now part of our "Urban Area".
- Jamie Stasny supports monthly updates at MTAC including status updates and highlights of critical issues with an opportunity for questions.
- Manny Contreras asked what the percentages of land makeup in Clackamas County from the map was in the UGB and what was in rural reserves. Mr. Reid would be following up with more details on this that describe the map categories and overlays in future presentations.
- Barbara Fryer noted the statistics that Manny is asking for would be helpful for all.
- Erik Cole noted that I haven't fully reviewed the roster nor the plan, but do we have workforce development input/representation in the plan? or at least an overlay with their data/plans? Mr. Reid noted we will be coordinating with our Metro Economic Development planner, Greater Portland, Inc and others on economic data plans throughout this process and reported on at meetings.

Adjournment (Chair MTAC, Eryn Kehe)

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by MTAC Chair Kehe at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, February 15, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	2/15/2023	2/15/2023 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	021523M-01
2	Work Program	2/8/2023	MTAC work program as of 2/8/2023	021523M-02
3	Work Program	2/7/2023	TPAC work program as of 2/7/2023	021523M-03
4	Draft Minutes	10/19/2022	Draft minutes from October 19, 2022 MTAC TPAC workshop	021523M-04
5	Report	February 2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Update Climate Smart analysis: estimating the GHG reduction gap	021523M-05
6	Appendix A	February 2023	Appendix A: Consultant analysis of the 2023 RTP GHG reduction gap	021523M-06
7	Report	February 2023	2024 Metro Council Urban Growth Management Decision: Draft work program summary	021523M-07
8	Presentation	2/15/2023	Regional School Walkshed Tool Data update & new interactive map tool - February 2023	021523M-08
9	Presentation	2/15/2023	2023 RTP Climate Smart Analysis: estimating the "GHG gap"	021523M-09
10	Presentation	2/15/2023	2024 Urban Growth Management Decision: Draft work program	021523M-10