



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, December 18, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Laura Terway
Laura Weigel
Jeff Owen
Glen Bolen
Don Odermott
Jean Senechal Biggs
Brendon Haggerty
Ramsey Weit
Andrew Campbell
Erin Wardell
Katherine Kelly
Ezra Hammer
Steve Williams
Taylor Eidt
Allison Boyd
Mike O'Brien
Carol Chesarek
Erika Palmer
Eric Hesse
Kim Rybold
Jae Douglas
Jaimie Huff
Steve Koper

Affiliate

Metro
MTAC – Oregon City
MTAC – City of Hillsboro
MTAC & TPAC – TriMet
MTAC & TPAC – Oregon Department of Transportation
TPAC – City of Hillsboro
MTAC – City of Beaverton
MTAC – Multnomah County Health
MTAC – Housing Affordability Organization Rep
Multnomah County Health Department
MTAC & TPAC – Washington County
MTAC & TPAC – City of Gresham
MTAC – Home Builders Association
Clackamas County
City of Hillsboro
TPAC – Multnomah County
MTAC – Environmental Science Associates
MTAC – Multnomah County Citizen Alternate
TPAC - City of Sherwood
MTAC & TPAC – City of Portland
City of Wilsonville
MTAC – Multnomah County Health
TPAC – City of Happy Valley
MTAC – City of Tualatin

Consultants/Workshop Presenters

Brandy Steffen, JLA
Kirsten Pennington, WSP
Nathan Preheim, Replica

Metro Staff Attending

Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager	Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Technology Strategist	John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Molly Cooney-Mesker, Senior Public Affairs	Walle Brown, Intern, Planning & Development
Jake Lovell, Intern, Planning & Development	Marie Miller, MTAC & TPAC Recorder

1. Call to Order and Introductions

Chairman Tom Kloster called the workshop meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made.

2. Comments From the Committee Members and Public

- Chairman Kloster announced that Metro Council approved the recommended TPAC community members that will begin January 2020. There will be three new members and three new alternate members. Orientation for new members is being scheduled early January.
- Jeff Owen announced that with the retirement of the Director of Strategic Planning & Policy, the position is posted on the TriMet website.

3. Jurisdictional Transfer Framework – Application of Methodologies (John Mermin, Metro, Brandy Steffen, JLA, Kirsten Pennington, WSP)

John Mermin and Chairman Kloster described the purpose of the regional framework for highway jurisdictional transfer study, which is to identify which state-owned routes in greater Portland should be evaluated and considered for a jurisdictional transfer, sort them based on regional priorities, and address some of the opportunities and barriers to transfer the routes. The decision framework will serve as a tool for state, regional and local jurisdiction leaders to identify promising candidate roadways for transfer and facilitate successful transfer of roadway ownership. The study is convened by Metro in collaboration with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Kirsten Pennington provided an overview of the workshop. The team would be sharing what had been done to date and next steps, summarizing the technical evaluation results, and summarizing readiness criteria categories. Following the break out discussion session, reports from the group discussions, with next steps on the process provided.

The committees were directed to note the memo in the packet: Corridor Segment Selection Methodology and Technical Evaluation Results. In this memo corridor segment selection methodology shares how it is framed by the four pillars of the 2018 RTP: Climate change, Equity, Safety and Congestion relief. The methodology has a preliminary screening to screen out segments that are not viable candidates for jurisdictional transfer because of their intended vehicle throughput function. Then round 2 for technical evaluation (to identify the most promising segments as candidates from a technical perspective), and readiness evaluation (for the readiness of the local jurisdiction to receive an arterial highway).

The team will evaluate and compare results from Round 2a and Round 2b to develop recommendations for consideration. The team completed Round 1 and Round 2a in fall 2019, and will complete Round 2b to develop recommendations in summer 2020. The readiness evaluation lags the technical evaluation to allow roadway function to inform transfer discussions.

Small group discussions were held after which reports from the groups were presented. Key discussion points are described in detail in the workshop summary. This summary is included in the full workshop meeting packet and listed in the public document records. Comments on the discussion points from the workshop and materials in the packet were encouraged to be sent to Mr. Mermin by January 10.

Presentation and Discussion

Attendees were asked to send additional comments via email to John by January 10, 2020. Key questions or comments collected during the introductory presentation included:

- Some of the road segments are discontinuous, meaning a roadway is not designated wholly to one jurisdiction or another. An example of this is Highway 26 in Clackamas County. Why are some segments not designated as highway segments?
 - This segment has already transferred to Gresham, but it is a good example of opportunity for transfer. The segments are categorized so that counties and cities can look at what it would look like to transfer them individually.
- Some of the criteria from the technical analysis represented a yes/no scale. Can we explore how we have approached this binary scale?
 - This is exactly the type of thing we are looking for you to address in the discussion groups. The results need to make common sense when made into a recommendation.
 - We've addressed that issue in the technical memo.
- How did the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) pillars figure into the Technical Assessment Memo? How were the pillars, safety, and congestion considered?
 - The table shows how the criteria are consistent with the RTP pillars; shows consistency and alignment with regional transportation goals.
- Is there a way to further refine the density of conflict point criteria, differentiating between residential and business driveways?
 - For this analysis, all driveways were treated equally, but this would be a good comment to note during the small group discussion.
- I feel like these criteria are missing the fact that some of these segments are going between places; communities and industries rely on them. This is a significant flaw in the methodology.
- The immediate exclusion of the Multnomah County section of US 26 is something that we need to revisit. This has an enormous potential impact. There is a section planned for urbanization and communities impacts along the Springwater Plan Area. If we can pull that one in for discussion it would be helpful.
- Will the readiness criteria look at the financial pieces?
 - Yes.
- How did the determination of jurisdiction come about? In specifically looking at Hwy 219, one segment is Hillsboro and two are Washington County. TV Highway is labeled as Hillsboro, but we only have one arterial; all others are managed by Washington County. What was the rationale behind assigning jurisdiction like this?
 - This was a result of the mapping by jurisdictional boundary. Please flag this during the discussion.
- There is a footnote about community engagement in the technical memo. But community engagement is something that needs to be applied to all the segments.

Brandy Steffen then asked participants to address the following topics:

1. Technical evaluation results: What do you think about the technical evaluation results; do they seem valid? Do they make sense? If not, what would you change?
2. What needs to be assessed to determine readiness? Examples: Political interest, funding availability, location in underserved communities, transfer experience, maintenance experience, etc.

After 40 minutes of discussion, facilitators reported out the main discussion points for their groups. See the summary and key discussion points below. Following the report out, Kirsten reminded participants of the next steps for the project, including that Metro is continuing the parallel analysis of Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) roadway classifications and plans to discuss at TPAC in March 2020. Metro will share the results from this and future readiness analysis at a future meeting. Participants can send in comments by email to John Mermin by January 10, 2020 for consideration.

Small Group Summary

While each of the small groups had different discussions, some overarching themes emerged. Many were concerned about the methodology used in the technical evaluation and presented ideas to re-evaluate or alter some of the technical assessment criteria, such as equity and safety. Many groups also listed specific segments that were ruled out by the current methodology that they thought needed to be re-evaluated. While addressing readiness criteria, groups suggested criteria to measure willingness to partner, financial readiness, current conditions of the segment, current plans, and effects on the local community.

Key Discussion Points/Comments

Key discussion points and comments are summarized below.

Technical Evaluation

Equity/Safety

- Several would like details on how the RTP pillars apply to equity and safety.
- There is a lot more to safety and equity in a community than just transportation issues; they are all interconnected.
- All eleven criteria had equal weight; bike, ped, and transit all got their own criterion while safety only has one. The technical assessment might not accurately capture safety. Was this intentional? If not, this needs to be re-evaluated.

Exceptions/Revising Methodology

- Make exceptions for significant or obvious segments that were ruled out by the methodology.
- Participants questioned if the methodology ruled out an obvious segment whether that means that the methodology is flawed or needs to be adjusted.
- Specific examples noted by participants are:
 - US 26 in Multnomah County near the Springwater Plan Area
 - Safety scores on Hwy 99W
 - Sandy Boulevard. in Gresham
 - Powell Boulevard.
 - Sections A3 & 4
 - The priority designation for the SW Corridor was low, please check
 - I-5 and 217: the redundancy designation was low, but these came out similar; they need to be re-evaluated
 - Steel Bridge: although this is an especially important piece of the regional transportation system, it is privately owned and might not be worth pursuing the transfer because of that difficulty
 - Check segments J1 & J2 of 99W for Safety score
 - Check OR 8 freight designation in RTP & MTS
 - Why does 99E segment stop at the bridge?

Other Comments

- Ease of maintenance should be a technical criterion.

- The 2040 growth concept seems understated and should be more integrated into the technical evaluation.
- Add to the technical memo that this is not the only way to do a jurisdictional transfer.
- The technical memo needs to include some discussion about how each criterion was chosen and evaluated, specifically the driveway density criteria and information about local driveways.
- The methodology may be double counting the transit criteria because one piece includes looking at more stops.
- The transit criteria should focus on something other than stop frequency.
- Some participants thought it would be difficult to convince jurisdictions to take on highly ranked transfers. Metro needs to put more thought into messaging and clarifying what a high-ranking means.
- The technical analysis is a living document and needs to consider regional growth.
- The threshold of 50% is remarkably high, meaning it might be leaving things out.
- The “local plans” criterion is not technical; it is about readiness.
- Some participants voiced concerns about the accuracy and thoroughness of the data used in the technical analysis. Metro needs to make sure they are using current data.

Readiness Criteria

Willingness to Partner

- Hillsboro is not interested in being a jurisdictional partner.
- Jurisdictions must be willing/able to support freight by supporting the “hole-in-the-air” designation.
- Jurisdictional interest in partnership should be the number one criterion.
- Political will is one of the most important criteria in assessing readiness.

Financial Readiness

- Jurisdictions will need to know both the upfront acquisition and transfer costs and the ongoing maintenance costs.
- Political will and financing are different things; financing is looking at putting together a realistic financial package, while political will is something different.
- Some participants thought cost should not be a factor as it would unfairly discriminate against segments with more complex issues, higher land values, or fewer financial resources.
- Consider the ability to work with or find a financial champion or public/private partnership and any economic development benefits.
- Availability of funding should be a readiness criterion.
- Transfer should take advantage of all funding opportunities including work by ODOT and the T2020 ballot measures. One participant asked if inclusion on the 2020 ballot measure should be a criterion.

Current Conditions

- Factor in the current conditions and state of repair of the roadway into its readiness as well as the current function of the road.
- The ability of a jurisdiction to provide continued maintenance should be included as a criterion; this includes the staff capacity to provide maintenance.
- The readiness criteria should look at the completeness of an area to applicable urban standards, i.e., complete sidewalks, and its compliance with regional mobility standards.

- Metro needs to factor in how well the road is currently serving the existing community and how desirable a segment is for transfer and investment.; e.g., pedestrian and storefront uses make the roadway more desirable.

Current Plans

- Need to look at current plans including housing, transit, and land use plans on a regional level.
- Need to prioritize connections to corridors as well as the corridors themselves, especially in less connected places.
- Include both current-and long-range regional plans in this evaluation.

Community Impacts

- There might be negative downstream implications for communities that are reliant on mobility and freight.
- Metro needs to prioritize understanding the effects that transfer will have on communities and on communicating those with certain specific cultural organizations.
- The safety rating of a segment should be a criterion.
- Equity needs to be a criterion and Metro needs to be intentional about addressing gentrification.

Additional Comments

- Consider a new criterion if small segments have already been transferred.
- Does it make sense to remove all segments that are designated expressways or throughways at the beginning?
- We are looking at jurisdictional transfer and readiness as various, disparate segments, but we need to look at how the segments function together regionally. We need more discussion on how this should be evaluated, but we could include an overall score of the segment based on the value to the region, including if transfer would result in more continuous ownership.

4. Replica Transportation Data Tool (Eliot Rose, Metro/Nathan Preheim, Replica)

Eliot Rose provided an overview of a new data tool called Replica. Metro, Portland, and TriMet are testing this tool for accuracy and privacy, and if it passes our tests it will be available to agency partners beginning in Spring 2020.

Replica is a detailed simulation of travel patterns based on big data. Unlike more traditional data forecast tools, Replica makes data on travel patterns accessible to users through a web tool and is more frequently updated. Replica provides detailed simulated data for a seasonal average travel week, and a year of access includes four quarterly data updates. The data includes:

- Attributes: Origin/destination, modes of travel, purpose of the trip, home/work location, and demographic information
- Aggregation: transportation analysis zones, network link (spatial), hours of day/day of the week
- Format: Viewable via limited-access web tool, allows for limited downloads of data

We do not receive any of the input data that goes into creating Replica since that data can raise privacy concerns.

Metro is interested in Replica because compared to other data sources it is more comprehensive, covering a wider variety of modes, includes more detailed information about traveler demographics

and trip purposes, and is more frequently updated. We get to test the data in detail for accuracy and privacy before we accept and pay for it. And the tool will be accessible to our public agency partners for better planning. We hope to apply the data in a number of projects that advance Metro's core RTP values of congestion, safety, climate and equity.

A project overview was provided. Agencies that will be eligible for access to Replica include local governments, transit agencies and university partners in the Portland region and Clark County. We are now testing and calibrating the tool, and we estimate that we will complete that process and make data available in March 2020. If Replica passes our tests, Metro will be making it available to partners from March 2020-March 2021. Agency partners who want access to the data will need to sign an IGA with Metro covering responsible use of data, guidelines for publishing/sharing data, and responding to requests for data. Individual users must sign an acknowledgement form and be approved by the Metro project manager.

An onscreen demonstration was provided with a question/answer session.

Comments from the committee:

- Carol Chesarek asked where the data came from. Mr. Rose reported it was from a cellular phone carrier, noting that Metro does not have access to the actual data for privacy issues, but only the outputs from the model that is created using that data.
- Don Odermott asked how the tool differentiates between modes and routes. Nathan Preheim from Replica described how Replica is built and calibrated using ground truth data from various modes of travel. They can use the data to assess how people choose modes and routes and provide more comprehensive data than a transit agency like TriMet might have access to through its own system. They model travel into a region by people from surrounding counties to provide a complete accounting of trips. Mr. Odermott added that Washington County collects some similar data about vehicle speeds and movements on roads.
- Erin Wardell asked how the data was calibrated when purpose of the trip is not known. Mr. Preheim reported that trip purposes are estimated based on factors such as time of day and distance to work/home. Replica uses information on type of business or work/recreation locations to inform those estimates. Ms. Wardell suggested that it was important to look at trip chaining, and Chris Johnson noted that this may be possible by using Replica as an input to Metro's upcoming activity-based travel model. He added that the data is used to build Replica is more comprehensive than the 6,000 surveys used to build the travel model. Mr. Rose added that no data source is perfect, and Metro will be mindful of not overselling the data. When sharing the data with agency partners we will emphasize the context in which this is collected and analyzed.
- Glen Bolen asked how Replica captured trips to services, and to locations not easily accessed due to land use issues. Mr. Rose noted our Parks department's interest in the tool to help understand how people access regional parks. There is potential overlap with how our partners might use Replica to look at access to other destinations.
- Carol Chesarek asked how Metro would use this new data tool with other modeling and connecting tools. Mr. Rose reported that Replica complimented our modeling tools, and could help supplement them over time. Chris Johnson added that Replica is a learning pilot that can

compare to models now under development. Metro is planning its large scale travel survey in 2021, which is expected to cost \$1-1.2 million, and the costs limit updates to every 10 years. Supplementing this data with a source like Replica could help Metro update our model more frequently and cost-effectively.

- Carol Chesarek asked how privacy was being addressed, and noted that personal information can be discerned from data on people's travel patterns. Mr. Rose noted that the agreement with Replica requires that real individuals not be identifiable in the Replica data, and that we will be reviewing both the data and methodology for privacy protection.
- Allison Boyd asked what geographical extent for origin/destination was covered with the data. Mr. Rose reported this included all three Metro Counties in Oregon and Clark County, WA.
- Glen Bolen asked how potential issues with privacy are addressed given that and the public is not aware of when or how location data is collected. Mr. Preheim noted that papers are provided to customers on the collection and use of data which can be shared with the public.
- Laura Terway asked how the data was being calibrated where there is limited public transportation access in rural areas. Mr. Preheim reported that cell phone data is not 100% accurate, but that where pockets of areas with limited accessibility can be tied to census data it can help identify infrequent transit trips. Chris Johnson added that Replica may enable Metro to refocus our surveys on rural areas and other areas not well-represented in traditional data sources.
- Don Odermott if the data was available beyond the four counties that showed resident to work locations and back outside the four counties. Mr. Rose confirmed there is a buffer regional area available in Replica that shows into and out of the region travel. Metro staff demonstrated how to access data on travel into/out of the region.

Mr. Rose noted that the committees would next hear results and where in the process we are in the pilot at a future committee meeting. Interested agencies and jurisdictions are encouraged to contact Mr. Rose with questions about Replica data or the IGA process.

5. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12 noon.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC & MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, MTAC & TPAC workshop meeting, December 18, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	12/18/19	12/18/2019 TPAC & MTAC Workshop Agenda	121819T-01
2	TPAC/MTAC Work Program	12/11/2019	TPAC/MTAC Work Program, as of 12/11/2019	121819T-02
3	Minutes	11/20/2019	Draft minutes from Nov. 20, 2019 MTAC meeting	121819T-03
4	Handout	Dec. 2019	Metro Highway Jurisdictional Transfer Framework: corridor segment selection methodology and technical evaluation results, draft	121819T-04
5	Handout	Dec. 2019	Regional framework for highway jurisdictional transfer	121819T-05
6	Presentation	12/18/2019	Regional Framework for Highway Jurisdictional Transfer	121819T-06
7	Presentation	12/18/2019	Replica demo	121819T-07