



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 | 10 a.m. to 12 noon

Place: Virtual conference meeting held via Zoom

Members, Alternates Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Chris Deffebach
Eric Hesse
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Don Odermott
Jeff Owen
Jon Makler
Karen Williams
Lewis Lem
Glenn Koehrsen
Gladys Alvarado
Idris Ibrahim
Jamie Stasny
Steve Williams
Allison Boyd
Jaimie Huff
Glen Bolen
Jerry Andersen
Carol Chesarek
Raymond Eck
Tom Armstrong
Colin Cooper
Jean Senechal Biggs
Laura Weigel
Chris Damgen
Steve Koper
Jennifer Donnelly
Anne Debbaut
Cindy Detchon
Nina Carlson
Darci Rudzinski
Brittany Bagent
Ramsay Weit
Rachael Duke
Ezra Hammer

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Washington County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City 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
Port of Portland
Community Member
Community Member
Community Member
Clackamas County
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Clackamas County Citizen
Multnomah County Citizen
Washington County Citizen
City of Portland
City of Hillsboro
City of Beaverton
City of Milwaukie
City of Troutdale
City of Tualatin
Department of Land and Conservation Development
Department of Land and Conservation Development
North Clackamas School District
Northwest Natural
Private Economic Development Organizations
Greater Portland, Inc.
Housing Affordability Organization
Housing Affordability Organization
Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Portland

Guests Attending

Susie Wright
Mike Foley

Affiliate

Kittelson and Associates

Judith Gray
Abe Moland
Allison Brown
Bob Kellett
Brett Morgan
Casey Fergeson
Kate Bridges
Lidwien Rahman
Lucia Ramierez
Molly McCormick
Nick Fortey
Sara Wright
Warren Schyler
Will Farley

Fehrs and Peers
Clackamas County
JLA Public Involvement
Portland Bureau of Transportation
1000 Friends of Oregon

Steer Group
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Kittelson and Associates
FHWA
Oregon Environmental Council
City of Tigard
City of Lake Oswego

Metro Staff Attending

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Eryn Kehe, Communications
Clint Chiavarini, Research & Modeling
Dan Kaempff, Senior Transportation Planner
Lakeyscia Griffin, Communications
Kale Mattias, Associate Planner

Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager
Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner
Cindy Pederson, Research Manager
Chris Johnson, Research Manager
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Regional Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, TPAC & MTAC Recorder

1. Introductions and Call meeting to order (Chairman Kloster)

Chairman Tom Kloster called the workshop meeting to order at 10 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.

2. Comments from the Chair

- Committee input on “making safe space” via Wufoo comments was noted as not used for this workshop. The committee and guests were welcome to add their comments in the chat area or send directly to the Chairman.
- Metro was completing the second round of furloughs, beginning full time schedules at the start of 2021. Staff appreciated the patience from the committee reaching them with recent limited time.
- Brittany Bagent announced the Greater Portland, Inc. release of the Economic Recovery Plan with links to these materials in the chat area. An implementation task force is being formed. A more formal presentation on this plan can be scheduled in 2021.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items (none)

4. Regional Mobility Policy Update (Kim Ellis, Metro, Lidwien Rahman, ODOT)

Kim Ellis, Metro, began the project update by reiterating the project purpose and how this policy would connect with state and local decisions, while focusing on the transportation system plan level and informing plan amendments in the future. Kim shared an updated project timeline, emphasizing the work that has already been done and the engagement and policy development ahead. She noted that final actions will be made by both the Metro Council and the Oregon Transportation Commission.

5. Potential Mobility Policy Elements (Susie Wright, Kittelson Associates and Eryn Kehe, Metro)

Susie Wright, Kittelson and Associates, presented the potential mobility policy elements. She noted some of the key themes and observations from prior engagement, which include:

- Broad support and enthusiasm for an updated policy
- Develop a more holistic mobility policy
- Ensure the new policy is practical, legally defensible and not overly complex
- Context-sensitive policy to provide flexibility
- Ensure the new policy supports other outcomes (like equity, climate and safety)

Susie then referenced the key themes and observations from research on current approaches. She highlighted the survey that was sent out to workshop participants following the Oct. 21 TPAC/MTAC workshop, and the elements that were prioritized in that survey. These included:

- Safety
- Reliability
- Multi-modal mobility
- Vehicle Congestion
- Accessibility

Susie walked through how these elements are being framed, and some of the additional considerations that the team has identified to shape the update policy, which include the following key questions:

- Where do we need to provide mobility?
- Who are the priority users in different contexts?
- Which type of trips are priorities in different contexts?
- When are these trips happening (what time of day)?

To begin the discussion, Eryn Kehe, Metro, launched an informal poll question: *Have we identified the most important elements and are we on the right track?* Responses included:

- Yes (59%)
- Yes, but I have questions or comments (25%)
- No (0%)
- Uncertain (16%)

Additional comments and questions from the group included (responses from the presenter are italicized):

- It feels like we're on the right track, but this feels like it emphasizes cars and roads.
- The waiting periods that people have for transit, especially in the winter, are really challenging for the elderly.
- Another major issue is the 'first mile, last mile' for people to access transit. This is especially important for the elderly going from a rural area to an urban area or traveling to medical appointments. The ODOT transit hubs report provided previously is an important resource.
- This feels like it's pointing in the right direction, but as we unpack some of these comments, there seems to be more development needed. For example, moving efficiently is also important, and may require additional systems for evaluation (person miles vs. vehicle miles travelled, for example). There also is an opportunity to move away from vehicle movement to looking at access, especially equitable access to the places people need to go. The ultimate outcome of mobility is access.
- What is the geographic area that this mobility policy be applied? Is it just into the Metro UGB, or into the counties outside of UGB?
 - *The policy that is currently in place applies to the UGB, so the new policy will at least cover that.*

- *Intent is for this to apply to the urban area within Metro's planning authority. The statewide OTP/OHP update will address the rural areas and small towns outside Metro's planning authority.*
- The term "reasonable" requires some further clarification.
- There's a recognition across the region that we're not all in the same place or at the same density/level of development or level of serviceability when it comes to the availability of modal options. Transit, for example, drops off outside of the urban core today.
- We're also in different places around the region regarding infrastructure maturity. Local governments need the ability to require developers to complete gaps in the system.
- Predictably and efficiency expectations are different in different areas. We need to be able to craft the policy to reflect these differences.
- Queuing performance is being used as an indicator of safety in current traffic analysis.
- We need to respect the needs at the local level, where the legal implications are set. Metro would not be the entity sued based on any of this.
- Last time, we talked about climate goals as a part of the policy, but that wasn't elevated in the priorities from the survey. How does the climate element fit in this policy? Is it more of an outcome, or does it need to get back in here more explicitly?
 - *Some of the feedback we heard from the survey, is that it seemed like there was an overloading of what was most critical to include in the mobility policy when there are other regional policies for climate and safety. Staff acknowledge that this policy needs to support and advance the region's climate policies and implementation of the Climate Smart Strategy, for example. How we measure mobility needs to further achievement of desired climate and safety outcomes. The updated policy should also result in equitable outcomes for underserved and underrepresented communities.*
 - *VMT is one measure that could be used. It is identified in the Climate Smart Strategy and RTP as a way to track climate outcomes. VMT also helps measure safety/potential exposure to crashes, and has a relationship with other elements being considered for the updated policy.*
 - *Staff noted other elements of climate policy relate to the transition of fleets and fuels, but are outside of mobility policy.*
 - A participant noted in the chat: The efficiency element I was suggesting could also encompass VMT (or Person-miles Traveled (PMT) per VMT) and modal emission efficiency in my mind (not sure if this is Chat Acceptable), which would inform the projected GHG outcomes of the policy's application.
 - *Yes, though the demonstrated spatial (and associated emission) efficiencies could be relevant to include in the mobility policy, those are informed by fleet and fuel trends (not unlike the Climate Smart Strategy).*
- I have some questions about how 'reasonable' is being defined in the elements. We know we're going to have to define reasonable depending on 'where,' also what's reasonable on a throughway vs. an arterial, or at different times of day. There will be some variation in that definition depending on facility type or land use context. It won't be a one-size-fits-all.
 - *"Reasonable" was really the core of the current mobility policy when it was established. It gets down to what does the public expect and what are they willing to pay for to get where they need to go?*
- How calculations of the value of time people have and how it has changed factors in to determining reasonableness and would be good to know.

"Reasonable" will also depend on current performance on a number of measures - the RTP and other efforts have documented existing and future performance on many measures, and we are looking at those in this project.

6. Draft Criteria for Selecting and Testing Potential Mobility Performance Measures (Susie Wright, Kittelson Associates and Eryn Kehe, Metro)

Susie continued the presentation with an outline of the draft criteria for selecting and testing measures. She reminded the group on the proposed screening/selecting measures for testing, and that these would be measured through case studies. A critical component of this is ensuring that the criteria are clearly related to the policy elements, and other outcomes, to ensure that the evaluation will measure the right outcomes. She reviewed the draft criteria and potential measures.

To begin discussion, Eryn launched another poll question, asking *Is this a good set of criteria?*

Responses included:

- Yes (47%)
- Yes, but I have comments or questions (29%)
- No (0%)
- Uncertain (24%)

The group was asked to give feedback on the elements presented. Comments and questions included the following:

- Does the measure allow us to clearly see the distribution of benefits and burdens? Or, does the measure reveal to whom the benefits and burdens accrue?
- I don't understand how the criteria will be used. I don't think the mobility policy needs to carry the water for everything we do. It feels like we're making it harder than we need to.
 - *Don't have to have measures that accomplish all of this, but if able to have some overlap that is an added benefit.*
 - From chat: Keep it simple. "Demote" mobility as an overarching policy and put it on equal level with the other policies.
- Did you discuss an element related to efficiency? Then measures that pertain to how the systems are utilized? We have something of an Oregon tradition of "orderly and efficient provision of service."
- I would like to understand how these things impact individual employers.
- Having a measure already in use by an agency may be helpful in prioritizing between measures that are trying to measure/address the same goals/outcomes, but wouldn't want that criteria to trump prioritizing over other measures that ensure we are comprehensively addressing all the desired outcomes.
- It seems like you've done a lot of great work, but it will be really hard for me to take a position until I see what the measures are going to be and how they will be calculated.
- I do feel positive about the screening criteria, and the range of considerations identified there.
- Specific to the evaluation criteria: while I appreciate how some of these look to 'how these are used' to validate, but I would caution us on putting this at the same level of other criteria, as others may be more important.
- The last two criteria could be important (have been in use), but would say that they are less important than others. These might hem us into what we have done in the past which might not support what we want to do in the future. I suggested to use it as a tie-breaker.
- Many of the criteria have different health outcome implications, it would be great to take possible health impacts into account in testing and case studies.

- Talking about the ‘whom’ when looking at different kinds of mobility from the State’s perspective. It is important to measure the distribution of benefits and burdens between different populations, and which measures will work best to understand that.
- Using some of the Health Impacts assessments we started to develop through Climate Smart Strategy [and RTP] could be deployed here on the basis of VMT and other modal use. C40 and others have also advanced that practice that would be happy to connect team to that information.
- In addition to having representatives from SW Washington on MTAC/TPAC engage in this conversation, are there additional steps to consider the integration of and impacts from "across the river" mobility into this effort?
 - *They have reps on TPAC, MTAC, MPAC and JPACT and Metro and ODOT have representatives on the SW Washington technical and policy committees. We will be working with the SW Washington technical and policy committees to keep them informed at key places, and give them opportunities to provide feedback.*

The City of Portland is also revisiting their mobility policy and will likely have some things to share with the team and the regional discussion.

7. Next Steps (Kim Ellis, Metro and Lidwien Rahman, ODOT)

The group was asked to provide any additional comments to Kim Ellis, Metro, and Lidwien Rahman, ODOT, by December 23. January to March 2021, there will be additional engagement on the elements to include in the policy and ways to measure those elements. A third joint workshop of MTAC and TPAC is planned for April 21, 2021 from 10-noon. More information about the engagement schedule and opportunities to weigh-in will be available in January.

8. Adjourn (Chairman Kloster)

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:46 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, MTAC and TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting, December 16, 2020

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	12/16/2020	12/16/2020 MTAC and TPAC workshop meeting agenda	121620M-01
2	Memo	12/09/2020	TO: MTAC and TPAC members, and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, Metro Project Manager Lidwien Rahman, ODOT Project Manager RE: Metro/ODOT Regional Mobility Policy Update: Status Report	121620M-02
3	Attachment 1 to Memo	06/24/2020	Metro/ODOT Regional Mobility Policy Update Project purpose and objectives	121620M-03
4	Attachment 2 to Memo	Fall 2020	Regional mobility policy update fact sheet	121620M-04
5	Attachment 3 to Memo	August 2020	KEY FINDINGS BRIEF OREGON HIGHWAY PLAN MOBILITY POLICY WHITE PAPER	121620M-05
6	Attachment 4 to Memo	11/18/2020	REGIONAL MOBILITY POLICY UPDATE ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS CALENDAR 2020-21	121620M-06
7	Handout	12/09/2020	POTENTIAL MOBILITY POLICY ELEMENTS RECAP AND TPAC/MTAC SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY	121620M-07
8	Memo	12/04/2020	TO: Kim Ellis, Metro, and Lidwien Rahman, ODOT From: Susan Wright, PE, and Bryan Graveline, Kittelson & Associates, Inc. RE: Performance Measure Screening and Evaluation Criteria – DRAFT	121620M-08
9	Presentation	12/16/2020	Regional mobility policy update	121620M-09