



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) meeting**

Date/time: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual video meeting via Zoom

Members Attending

Eryn Kehe, Chair
Joseph Edge
Carol Chesarek
Victor Saldanha
Anna Slatinsky
Laura Terway
Steve Koper
Katherine Kelly
Jamie Stasny
Jessica Pelz
Gary Albrecht
Neelam Dorman
Laura Kelly
Manuel Contreras, Jr.
Gery Keck
Tara O'Brien
Bret Marchant
Brett Morgan
Nora Apter
Preston Korst
Mike O'Brien

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County Community Member
Multnomah County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Second Largest City in Washington County, Beaverton
Clackamas County: Other Cities, City of Happy Valley
Washington County: Other Cities, City of Tualatin
City of Vancouver
Clackamas County
Washington County
Clark County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Clackamas Water Environmental Services
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
TriMet
Greater Portland, Inc.
1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon Environmental Council
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Green Infrastructure/Sustainability, Mayer/Reed, Inc.

Alternate Members Attending

Kamran Mesbah
Faun Hosey
Dan Rutzick
Jean Senechal Biggs
Martha Fritzie
Kevin Cook
Kelly Reid
Cassera Phipps
Jacqui Treiger
Craig Sheahan
Brendon Haggerty
Ryan Ames

Affiliate

Clackamas County Community Member
Washington County Community Member
Largest City in Washington County: Hillsboro
Second Largest City in Washington County: Beaverton
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Oregon Dept. of Land Conservation & Development
Clean Water Services
Oregon Environmental Council
David Evans & Associates, Inc.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Multnomah Co.
Public Health & Urban Forum, Washington Co.

Guests Attending

Ariel Kane
Barbara Fryer

Affiliate

City of Portland
City of Cornelius

Dakota Meyer
Kevin Young
Marc Farrar
Max Nonnamaker
MJ Andersen
Paul Comery
Robert McCracken
Sam Brookham

City of Troutdale

Metropolitan Land Group, LLC
Multnomah County Health Department
Multnomah County
WSP

Portland Bureau of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Cindy Pederson, Clint Chiavarini, Dennis Yee, Eliot Rose, Eryn Kehe, Jake Lovell, Lake McTighe, Laura Combs, Marie Miller, Matt Bihn, Ted Reid, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster

Call to Order, Quorum Declaration and Introductions

Chair Eryn Kehe called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. A quorum was declared. Introductions were made. Zoom logistics and meeting features were reviewed for online raised hands, renaming yourself, finding attendees and participants, and chat area for messaging and sharing links. An overview of the agenda was given.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

- **Updates from committee members around the Region** – none given.
- **Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update** (Chair Kehe) A report from Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager was read. MPAC and TPAC recommendations were discussed at their recent meetings with both committees approving the RTP moving forward. MPAC's action included a new recommendation concerning the Regional Mobility Policy project. If adopted by JPACT and Metro Council it would split the project into two phases and move the construction implementation stage to the strategic project list. The preliminary engineering phases would stay in this constrained project list, allowing the project to move forward in the PE phase.

TPAC had mixed support of the phasing and had a lot of questions about what the implication might be. TPAC used MPAC's recommendation as a starting point for their recommendation to JPACT. Because of the political nature of the recommendation about the phasing, TPAC did not take a position on the MPAC recommendation but recommended that JPACT discuss and consider MPAC's recommendation themselves. TPAC recommended that JPACT approve the overall RTP. ODOT voted no on the phasing recommendation with this expected to be a main discussion item at the JPACT meeting tomorrow morning. The JPACT packet was shared in chat: <https://oregonmetro.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=E1&ID=1132749&GUID=1D35FBF7-FF1A-42F2-8A38-F33C223A2024>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none given.

Consideration of MTAC minutes October 18, 2023 meeting

Chair Kehe asked for a vote to approve MTAC minutes from October 18, 2023 meeting.

ACTION: Motion passed with 16 votes in favor, 0 against, 3 abstentions: Jamie Stasny, Kevin Cook, Carol Chesarek

Regional Transportation Safety Performance Report (Lake McTighe, Metro) The presentation began with the names of people killed in traffic crashes in the month of October in the 3-county areas of Metro, which is a practice shared at TPAC and JPACT. The purpose of the presentation was to provide an update on traffic deaths and serious injuries in the region and seek feedback on the *DRAFT Safe Streets for All: Regional Transportation Safety Update to JPACT and the Metro Council* before bringing it to the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT) and the Metro Council in December and January.

With a goal of eliminating traffic deaths and life changing injuries by 2035, and using a data driven and Safe System approach, the Regional Safety Strategy provides strategies and actions to address serious traffic safety problems. An introduction to the Safe System Approach was provided. Notable Safety Actions Since 2021 (Table 1 in report) was shared. Actions since 2021 Safe People, Safe Roads, Safe Vehicles, Safe Speeds, and Post-Crash Care (Table 1) was shared.

Updates on the Roadway Safety Problem indicate traffic deaths are increasing, and pedestrian deaths have risen disproportionately over the past decade. Across all the measures summarized in Table 2 (Federal Safety Performance Measures), the region's streets have gotten less safe since compared to baseline data established in 2015. While the total number of crashes has decreased since 2007, the number of deadly crashes has increased. This pattern points to the need to focus on the contributing factors of fatal traffic crashes, namely intoxication, speed, roadway design, pedestrian safety, and heavier vehicles. Taking Action – New Safety Strategies (Table 3 in report) was shared. Next steps with the program:

- November 30, 2023 – Deadline to provide feedback
- December 14, 2023 –JPACT
- January 16, 2024 (tent.) –Metro Council work session
- Spring 2024 – Convene regional SS4A safety work group
- Fall 2024 –Provide status update on serious crashes and on the Safe Streets for All project to JPACT and Metro Council

Comments from the committee:

Carol Chesarek noted if I was reading the information correctly it looked like drug-based intoxication was the largest single contributing factor to accidents. But I didn't see anything in the actions that was aimed at drug-based intoxication as opposed to alcohol. I wanted to make a suggestion and ask a question. The suggestion is to maybe go back and look at whether either the legalization of marijuana or measure 110 made any difference³ in the rates of crashes that might be related to those measures. The question is if there is anything we think we can do in that space because it's disappointing not to see any potential actions there.

Lake McTighe noted there are a few actions that are kind of molded together with alcohol but in terms of upstream public health types of actions, a great suggestion. There's limited reports and some mixed results coming from looking at the legalization of marijuana and measure 110. In terms of the increase, I do think that's an important thing to look at and to continue to see there were some recent legislation passed around driving under the influence of psilocybin and then also looking at DUI. Upstream care and intervention is one of the best things that we can do. This is an area we can look at in terms of

vehicle detection. There is technology that can detect higher alcohol blood level. If they enter a car and touch the steering wheel or breath in the car it won't start. There is effort at the Federal level to have those be implemented, added to all new vehicles by 2026. The data in the crash report is not perfect. But there's a lot of different ways we can take a look at this and I'll do more work on the report to highlight more work is needed to identify some of those potential strategies.

Manny Contreras appreciated the work which appears pretty comprehensive. One thought is I'd like to see where the deaths are actually occurring on a per capita basis by county. Because the numbers in Portland will show huge numbers and priority of projects will always be directed there. Secondly, the policy recommendations you're making make sense.

Ms. McTighe noted one of our goals with the Safe Streets for All funding is going to increase our capacity to do some research and investigation, to develop a lot of the data that I just showed but at each city and county level. In the report as a start there is a per capita traffic deaths by city and county. I mentioned earlier that Washington County has the lowest county per capita of traffic deaths. It's interesting to compare it some of those other counties and to the national level. Oregon has a higher traffic deaths per capita as does the US overall. The report also covers land use patterns, higher use of transit and less VMT overall per capita.

Mr. Contreras asked where cyclists fit into the whole play of deaths. How do they compare to other forms of transportation? It was noted people cycling is one area where we are trending downwards and we need to better understand that. That mode share is decreasing, so is the decrease in deaths attributed to that? We need to do some regression analysis and look at some of the contributing factors. There has been an increase in better bicycle infrastructure, separation, green paint, bike boxes, bike signals and such which we need to understand for cyclist safety.

Brendon Haggerty noted it's great see Metro focusing so much on this issue. It's a major public health concern. Unintentional injury is the third leading cause of death in Multnomah County and in Oregon, and the top one or two causes of death for children and youth. So this is very important for us. We also see the racial disparities and the trend going in the wrong direction. I like what I see in table 3 in that it tracks pretty closely with what we recommended in a county level report over the summer. I want to point out that one of those recommendations is to continue investments in behavioral health and harm prevention, which would be addressing the drug and alcohol piece of it. When we discussed that factor with our public health advisory board one of the things we heard loud and clear was to avoid blaming individuals and keep the focus on the systemic risks that we see to use that in our framing. I want to affirm and support that going forward. We need a system that can accommodate lot of human error without killing people. But that's pretty expensive and it takes a really long time. So while we're doing that we need harm reduction measures and automated enforcement is a good example of that. The Oregon Health Authority publishes a dashboard with injury rates (per capita) here:

<https://oregoninjurydata.shinyapps.io/transport/>

Michael O'Brien noted he was curious about providing some level of understanding of the actions in terms of impact or assumed impact to kind of start to prioritize the actions in a way that we're spending the money that we have to put towards this in the most efficient and effective way. And then

one other comment would be related to size of vehicle and the relation to traffic deaths, pedestrian traffic deaths, and bicyclist traffic deaths. And understanding the correlation between a large truck versus a compact car. Understandably you've got a lot more mass and a lot less visibility in a large vehicle. Presumably that correlates to a higher rate of death per vehicle, or per thousand vehicles or however you want to put it. What can we do to either disincentive or create actions around that kind of thing. Ms. McTighe noted yes, to both of them. Those are things that we want to do in the coming couple years.

Jamie Stasny appreciated the work given to the program. One question was how does what we're looking at doing here regionally play with or pay into the consideration by ODOT, and what are they doing? I know they have a different system so how do these two systems work together? Are they a part of this safe systems approach? Are they trying to incorporate some of those things into their systems? For context, this was something that came up as we started to consider the I-205 toll project as we were looking at the rerouting that would be happening from trying to avoid tolls that would put more trips on the local systems. I came to understand that often the crashes that happen on the local systems end up as fatalities more so than the crashes that will happen on the interstate system. Is there an interplay there or coordination around that.

Ms. McTighe noted she was familiar with the ODOT Transportation Safety Action Plan, so could provide some perspective. The plan does acknowledge the safe system approach per se. It's a fairly new concept in the US. Federal Highway Administration has been starting to implement it over the last five year or so. We are still figuring out how we fit systems into existing concepts. There are a lot of factors that contribute to the safe travel of people in vehicles freeways versus on urban arterials. ODOT and others of us are learning more about this and advocating for it for safer roadways. Ms. Stasny noted my questions is there an action that can require an elevated level of incorporation of the safe systems approach as we are considering pricing in the region, as we're considering the impacts of rerouting and diversion? My suggestion is to think about how we might be able to encourage that state level of coordination or incorporation of that approach as we consider the impacts from that.

Chair Kehe asked about details on the safety work group. Ms. McTighe noted this was just starting and would be very open like an ad hoc group. The group is planned to increase awareness and understanding of the safe street system, weighing in on details and how actions on phasing, highest impact, the coordination around legislative issues, and what data to develop. The agencies are working together and developing safety action plans now. Interest in participating with the group is welcome.

Dan Rutzick noted, to Mr. O'Brien's point about larger vehicle trucks and even SUVs causing exponentially more harm when there are crashes. To what extent does this work involve creating limitations to where larger trucks can go on local streets and other kinds of lower classification roadways? Ms. McTighe noted I don't think Metro is going to get involved in that type of regulation but there's new awareness now these are just like regular trucks. Cities and counties with this information want to have those types of restrictions. I know many places already do sort of have this for delivery trucks and semis. I think the purpose of the regional work will be to pull together information that's happening at the national level. Researching some of the in-vehicle safety features can help prevent crashes. There are a lot of different things that could be championed more at a legislative level. We

want to lobby for this. So it's important about providing the information so that jurisdictions that have that oversight can make better decisions.

2024 Urban Growth Management Decision: Buildable lands inventory update (Ted Reid and Clint Chiavarini, Metro) Ted Reid began the presentation on the 2024 urban growth management decision timeline. Capacity is one of the three main components of the analysis in the UGR. Factors to consider were described in how deciding how much land is buildable inside the UGB. Clint Chiavarini presented information on what the process was to evaluate a buildable land inventory. Completed in October were local reviews of buildable land inventories. Now through January 2024 the likelihood of development or redevelopment of land using the Pro Forma capacity model will be used. Other pending technical work was noted:

- Residential and employment trends
- Regional forecast (population, households, jobs)
- Regional housing demand analysis
- Employment land demand analysis
- Demographic analysis of past UGB expansions

Comments from the committee:

Anna Slatinsky noted this is obviously a very general overview but when we look at the employment and population trends everyone understands we're in a housing crisis with insufficient housing being produced. This is not an Oregon or Metro problem, but a national problem. One of the dynamics that we're starting to hear from employers is they are having trouble recruiting employees due to the high cost of housing. As you're kind of tweaking the model and looking at how to make the analysis valid both for the need for housing and the need for employment and, ow that feedback loop where a shortage of housing or the cost of housing actually has an impact works or how the results of the model are interpreted. It as noted this would be answered in the next presentation.

Dan Rutzick noted earlier in the presentation was talk of capacity. There are areas at the edges of cities that were brought into the urban growth boundary. Some of them are in the process of urbanizing and some have the infrastructure for utilities a distance away. There are residential infill projects that may have sanitary sewer a distance from some of them, and that has to be expanded as well. Can you talk a little bit about when identifying capacity, what's the coordination between Metro and local governments to get a sense of is this larger geography likely to be served in two years, assuming the markets there, or is it five years out?

Mr. Reid noted we rely on local review for buildable land inventory I our capacity estimates. We have been getting this question about infrastructure availability pretty regularly as we've been presenting this work. So clearly it's on everyone's mind, the shortage of funding to support development of land. I think that the focus on land readiness and what it actually takes to take land and produce housing and jobs on it is an important one that we'll have to keep working on as a region, in all our programs and partnerships because we can't come up with a pot of money in this growth management decision. I think as with many topics, growth management sort of highlights what is on people's minds, and I think infrastructure funding is one of those things. Chair Kehe added our charge at Metro is at the regional scale and for a 20-year outlook. So our job is to determine what the demand, the capacity for growth in

the growth boundary for the next 20 years is. We're coming up with a capacity number for 20 years. I think the work is really knowing what's coming in the close term is going to be more associated with the local housing implementation strategies. We're really looking long term.

Mr. Rutzick noted that was my understanding when taking on this work. If local governments provided input to Metro for the BLI for both the residential and employment land, there hasn't been that step that I'm aware of where Metro asked in an expansion area, is this entire expansion area to be served in 20 years or is that step coming in the coming months as capacity? Chair Kehe added the state doesn't ask us to look at an analysis of land inside the urban growth boundary in the expansion area. For lands that have been brought into the UGB we'll certainly count that land as potential capacity over the next 20 years. And as described, we look to city developed concept plans or comprehensive plans to figure out what kind of capacity those areas will provide.

Bret Marchant asked will your analysis look at kinds of sizes of developable parcels? The size of acreage obviously impacts the work we do on industrial projects but could impact multi-family developments too. If all the developable parcels are of a smaller acreage size. Mr. Chiavarini noted the proforma model takes that into account. For instance, it's a half-acre parcel and the best use may be a fourplex or something to that effect. Whereas a 10-acre parcel, depending on the cost and market conditions may be a four story apartment. So the model goes through a building selection of types and then applies that to parcel size, parcel valuation, the market in that particular area, that kind of thing. There is a bunch of levers that it looks at and trying to figure out. Then the capacity number comes out of that based on them. It's based on what's already there. More information was shared on the analysis of lot size distribution and probability of redevelopment. The link to the Metro site readiness toolkit published in 2020 was shared: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/tools-partners/guides-and-tools/site-readiness-toolkit>

Faun Hosey asked is most land outside the UGB generally regarded as potential expansion area? Is there a meaningful way to give consideration to soils maps or values of current land uses (for example, needs of wildlife habitat and our agricultural industry)? Anna Slatinsky noted areas for future UGB expansions have been formally identified as 'Urban Reserves'. Areas that do not have this designation would be difficult to propose for addition to the UGB at this point. Chair Kehe noted Metro Council only has authority to bring "urban reserves" into the growth boundary in their decision next year. You can find a map on this page that shows urban and rural reserve areas.

<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/2040-growth-concept> Ms. Slatinsky noted I think the Urban Reserve and Rural Reserve designations are intended to be for a 50-year timeframe. Ms. Hosey added yes, 50-yr protection is intended, and Metro is bound by approved maps. Meanwhile, legislation is proposed every year to impose changes, and county roads are planned across farmland outside UGBs.

Joseph Edge noted there's a lot of interest in townhouses. They may not be as efficient as developing residential lots with quadplexes. So when you're looking at highest and best use or most likely development outcomes, given that there's a lot of interest in townhouses right now, how does this factor in the likelihood of townhouses, and how they will actually use the land. The second question is with last week's report from the Census Bureau about the US population projected to start declining by the end of this century. What is the relationship of that data with our own growth projection data used

to justify urban growth boundary expansion and understanding that obviously the US is a dynamic system and there will still be migration that is not proportionate to overall population. Mr. Chiavarini noted with the first question that gets into the complexities, the proforma. And I'm not entirely well versed on how that works. I do know that there are going to be limits so that it won't simply throw fourplexes on every single lot, just because that happens to be the highest and best use. There'll be some sort of saturation where after that you don't just get all one type of building, that there ends up being some sort of mix that's into the model.

2024 Urban Growth Management Decision: Overview of approach to estimating housing demand

(Ted Reid and Dennis Yee, Metro) Ted Reid began the presentation on the regional housing demand analysis. The housing demand analysis will include assessments of existing and future needs. The existing housing needs are for those experiencing houselessness and historic underproduction - what is the backlog of housing units to date?

Dennis Yee explained the future needs with the 20-year forecast. This is a regional population forecast and household forecast with housing needs estimated by household size and presence of kids, income, and age/life stage. The housing demand modeling methodology combines forecasts of households by socioeconomic characteristics (from Metro) with factors impacting housing choice to estimate housing need by housing typology. These include household life stage, ability to pay, tenure split, and choice. Levers and scenarios testing will be included in the analysis, including Growth Scenarios, Tenure Split, Cost Burdening, Migration Leakage, and Isolate Household Types.

Chair Kehe reminded the committee this look is just getting started. Staff was asked what is the timeframe we can expect to see some of the results. Mr. Reid noted our consultants are in the midst of getting this model up and running. We are hoping to come back to MTAC with some preliminary information next spring not only on the capacity side but what the housing demand side might look like. We'll be describing both these as ranges because of the uncertainty that's inherent in looking out 20 years. As well some of the assumptions that we have to make to do this modeling.

Comments from the committee:

Joseph Edge again noted the US Census Bureau population projects with expected decline by 2100. It was asked what the relationship is between those kinds of projections and the projections we use for our own population modeling. Mr. Yee noted those relationships that you refer to are very strong because you are talking about mortality, statistics and neutrality statistics or assumptions going forward. As an urban region I would expect that our region would participate with the gross demographic trends that the Census Bureau sees. This is consistent with the PSU Population Center. Natural change in populations that we'll participate in for this trend will include population aging with proportion of households with elderly or middle-aged outpacing the younger age population. I'm not forecasting this region declining in raw or total numbers because we have something called net migration. Migration around the region is at different paces for different states. We anticipate that net migration which has been faster than other areas in the US which include rural and farmland areas.

Jamie Stasny wanted to thank everyone for all this work and thank you for your transparency. I think a lot has evolved over the years in the process as well as the partnerships that you're building with

community and bringing people in to help be apart of the conversation, and also the preemptive information sharing. I think there's been a huge advance made in how you're approaching this and how you're partnering with communities.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kehe at 11:13 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marie Miller".

Marie Miller, MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC meeting November 15, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	11/15/2023	11/15/2023 MTAC Meeting Agenda	111523M-01
2	MTAC Work Program	11/7/2023	MTAC Work Program as of 11/7/2023	111523M-02
3	Minutes	10/18/2023	Minutes from MTAC October 18, 2023 meeting	111523M-03
4	Memo	11/1/2023	TO: MTAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Principal Planner RE: DRAFT SS4A Regional Transportation Safety Update to JPACT and the Metro Council	111523M-04
5	Report	October 2023	Safe Streets for All Regional transportation safety update to JPACT and the Metro Council	111523M-05
6	Presentation	11/15/2023	Draft Safe Streets for All: Regional transportation safety update to JPACT and the Metro Council	111523M-06
7	Presentation	11/15/2023	Land capacity for growth	111523M-07
8	Presentation	11/15/2023	Regional housing demand analysis	111523M-08