

Oregon Public Transportation Plan

Policy Advisory Committee Meeting #3 Summary

Tuesday, July 26, 2016, 1:00 – 4:30 PM

Location: Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, 626 High Street NE, Salem

Committee members present

David Lohman (Chair), OTC
Steve Dickey, Salem-Keizer Transit
Ben Duncan, Multnomah County
Karen Girard (by phone), OHA
Amanda Hoey, Mid-Columbia Economic Development District
Sharon Konopa, City of Albany
Robin McArthur, LCDC
Neil McFarlane, TriMet
Jeff Monson (by phone), Commute Options
Tonia Moro, Rogue Valley Transit District
Dan O'Halloran, Rockwell Collins
Cosette Rees (by phone), Lane Transit District
Lisa Scherf, City of Corvallis
John David "JD" Tovey, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
Elaine Wells, Ride Connection

Committee members absent

Craig Campbell, AAA Oregon
Mark Labhart, Tillamook County
Bob Russell, Oregon Trucking Assoc.

ODOT staff present

Jerri Bohard, Transportation Development
Barbara Fraser, Transportation Development
Hal Gard, Rail and Public Transit
Erik Havig, Transportation Development
Brooke Jordan, Transportation Development
Jean Palmateer, Rail and Public Transit
Lucia Ramirez, Transportation Development

Other staff present

Kate Lyman, TriMet
Hailey Amundson, TriMet

Consultant staff present

Kirsten Pennington, CH2M
Ryan Farncomb, CH2M
Jeanne Lawson, JLA Public Involvement



Meeting Purpose

Finalize the working OPTP vision statement and provide direction on draft goal areas.

Key Meeting Outcomes

- The PAC agreed to delete the bullets from the draft vision statement, and instead, integrate stories or sidebars representing the ideas presented in the bullets throughout the OPTP document.
- For the vision and goals, the PAC asked the project team to focus on ensuring user-friendly language, avoiding subjective terms (e.g. “important”), and emphasizing outcomes.
- The PAC discussed all of the proposed goal areas, and had specific comments on each – including changes to many of the goal titles and language.
- The PAC agreed to ask the project team to work the vision and goals, and bring a revised draft back for discussion and agreement at the next PAC meeting (on 8/22/16).

Meeting Summary

Welcome and Introductions

Commissioner David Lohman welcomed the group and facilitated introductions.

In his opening remarks, Commissioner Lohman emphasized the importance of vision and goal setting. He also discussed the importance of social equity in the plan and stated that though it is difficult to represent all transit interests throughout the state, the plan process will include a robust public outreach program to involve transit providers and users and other stakeholders. He opened the floor to PAC comment.

Discussion followed:

- A PAC member commented on the importance of ensuring environmental justice and equity issues are addressed by the PAC. He noted the importance of ensuring that individuals most impacted by these decisions are given an opportunity for input on the plan. He also commented that the cost of transportation and affordability appear to be missing from the current vision and goals.
 - Another PAC member agreed with the previous statements and noted that ODOT should tap into other resources, like TriMet’s Transit Equity Advisory Committee, for input and review.



- Commissioner Lohman noted that funding for public transportation is an important issue surfacing from the Governor’s Transportation Vision Panel.

Jeanne Lawson, meeting facilitator, reviewed the agenda and asked if there were any changes to the PAC meeting #2 summary. There were no comments. Jeanne noted that Cosette and Elaine are members of the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) and will act as liaisons between PTAC and the OPTP.

Planning Updates

Project to Date: Lucia Ramirez, ODOT Project Manager, gave the group an update on progress on the OPTP. She noted that the vision and goals work is the foundation for policy development later in the process. She noted that ODOT reviewed the Existing Conditions Report and the Benefits of Public Transportation document with the TAC, per PAC recommendation. She noted that ODOT will be incorporating comments from the both the PAC and TAC and that the documents will be sent to the PAC before their November meeting.

Public involvement: Kirsten Pennington, consultant Project Manager, provided the group an overview of the public involvement and outreach strategy for the plan, organized around three major milestones. The first public touchpoint (listening meetings around the state and online open house) is occurring in September and October to introduce the project to stakeholders and the public and gather input regarding policy development.

Discussion followed:

- A PAC member asked how stakeholders would be identified for the listening meetings.
 - Staff noted that there will be one meeting per ODOT region and that the project team members will be working with the PAC to identify which stakeholders to engage during this public involvement milestone. Staff also encouraged PAC members to attend one or more of the listening meetings, if possible.
- A PAC member noted that there are large time gaps between the public involvement milestones. She asked how ODOT will keep groups engaged during these gaps.
 - Kirsten noted that ODOT sends updates to parties who have signed up via the website to keep stakeholders engaged, and plans a video and other updates for the website.
- Commissioner Lohman stated that public transportation providers should be incorporated into the outreach process and could help invite participants to the listening meetings.
- A PAC member asked how the project team would engage the environmental justice community to get input.
 - Kirsten stated that ODOT is working with its civil rights staff to address these issues. The project team will also engage with different groups (e.g. provider advisory committees)



in advance of public outreach. Kirsten noted that the team has a detailed public involvement plan for the overall project.

- Commissioner Lohman noted several TAC members are involved with equity as well.

Kirsten reviewed the PAC's input about the Benefits for Public Transportation from their first meeting. She also summarized TAC comments regarding the document, and how the project team will incorporate TAC and PAC input into the chapters of the OTP and a revision of the Benefits of Public Transportation document.

- A PAC member asked what "treatment of resiliency" meant.
 - Kirsten clarified that the document needs to be clear about the types of disaster resiliency issues that public transportation can help address (floods versus earthquakes, for example). She acknowledged that the term is technical, and the team can explain concepts in non-technical language in future products.

Draft Vision

Jeanne introduced the vision discussion, noting that it would refine the draft vision that the PAC developed at PAC meeting #2. She reminded the group that the vision is a working draft to guide the planning process that can be revisited later as needed (e.g. based on new information or input).

Discussion followed:

- A PAC member stated that the vision "bullets" could better parallel the structure of the last sentence of the vision (reliable, efficient, etc.).
- A PAC member commented on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goals, and suggested that the project team revise the vision to capture Oregon's and the Portland metro region's goals of reducing GHG emissions from transportation.
 - *The group agreed.*
- A PAC member noted that funding and provider geographies are tied together, complicating funding for public transportation. This presents a barrier to funding services in needed areas. Service is designed around how funding flows, while people travelling do not care about these artificial distinctions when travelling from A to B.
- A PAC member noted that "regions" could be construed to be ODOT regions. Consider revising this language.
 - *The group agreed.*
- A PAC member noted that the first bullet should be revised to state "all of Oregon" instead of the language referring to the desert or other specific geographies.



- A PAC member noted that there does not seem to be a strong connection to land use in the vision. Land use and transportation influence each other. Need a stronger connection to community decision.
- Commissioner Lohman stated that the vision should be re-written to include “affordable.” *The PAC agreed.* He also stated that the vision should address the reduced need for roadway capacity that transit can bring to communities. He also suggested removing the bullets.
 - Two PAC members agreed that the bullets could be removed.
 - A PAC member noted that he liked the bullets and that they should remain.
 - The group asked that the bullets be removed from the vision, but that they be illustrated in sidebars in the plan as “stories.”
 - *The group agreed that the vision bullets could be deleted, but the ideas should be retained in sidebar stories throughout the OPTP document.*
- A PAC member commented public transportation “makes urban areas work” and it helps further the goals of the Oregon land use system.
 - Commissioner Lohman added that public transportation also makes smaller urban areas work as well.
 - *The PAC agreed the project team could integrate this idea into the vision.*
- A PAC member suggested that the idea of the “culture of public transportation” should be integrated into the broader vision. *The group agreed.*
- A PAC member suggested that a story be created to illustrate the vision for the public; the vision uses technical language.

Goals Workshop

Jeanne introduced the Goals Workshop. The PAC broke out into small groups. Each group was assigned 3-4 goal areas, and asked to review the goal language for clarity and missing ideas.

After discussion, each group reported back to the entire PAC. Each group’s discussion points are summarized below:

Group 1 report out on Goals 1, 2, and 3:

- *Goal 1 - Mobility*
 - The distinctions between mobility, accessibility, and connectivity are wonky and overlap – revise Goals 1 and 2 to reflect (a) the system and (b) the individual users
 - Need to address Transportation Network Companies/private provider connections to the system



- Remove subjective terms such as “relative” or “important”
- Add “affordable” to “seamless . . . convenient”
- Merge current version into one sentence
- *Goal 2 – Accessibility and Connectivity*
 - Make the terms more logical to the average person
 - For the titles of goals 1 and 2 - one of the terms relates to the system and one relates to individual users
 - Define “important destinations” - needs to reflect different contexts of “importance”
 - Should be determined by local communities vision and goals
 - Remove “important”- suggest changing to “key”
 - Need to say urban, rural and *suburban*
- *Goal 3 – Community and Economic Vitality*
 - Add “Public and private sector interests work to...” to the beginning of the goal
 - Community livability is important as well as economic vitality
 - Focus on the existing as well as the future employment
 - Coordination with larger employers is important – locations have infrastructure and service implications
 - Housing locations matter (e.g. high-density on edges of urban areas)
 - Public transportation should collaborate with business and housing
 - Education and young people are important
 - Education is missing - add, and include vocational training, post-secondary training
 - Employers should factor transportation into their decision-making.
 - Add “suburban” to “urban and rural”
 - Refine zoning, tax incentives, business to recognize public transportation (a tactic)
 - Community and economic vitality are two distinct concepts
 - Need to highlight livability, connectedness and what ties those together – recommend that this be a separate goal
 - Change to “Community livability and economic vitality”



Group 2 report out on Goals 4, 5, and 6:

- *Goal 4: Equity*
 - Change to: “Public transportation is an essential tool to enhancing equity opportunities for all Oregonians”
 - Importance of eliminating barriers that prevent access to key destinations
 - Unclear what “more equitable” means
 - Equity means eliminating barriers that prevent access (e.g. key destinations, jobs, home)
 - Access broader co-benefits (e.g. ability to “improve” lives)
 - Add affordability
 - Goals should be outcome focused (e.g. people who are displaced can get to key destinations)
 - Delete the term “more” from “more equitable”
 - Using transportation as access to jobs is important
 - Equity is meeting needs of all populations (no need to spell out the groups)
- *Goal 5: Health*
 - Need to address air quality
 - Suggest: “Public transportation fosters increased physical activity, improves mental health, and connects people to each other”
 - The outcome is the system promotes physical activity
 - “Provide options for people to be physically active...” as opposed to “improve”
 - Public Transportation encourages and facilitates improvements in health
 - Connects people
 - Access to medical services
 - Physical activities increase
 - Sidewalks and bikeways are important in order to facilitate the transit system
 - Highlight community vitality
 - Consider: “Allow opportunities to integrate activity into everyday life”
 - There is a nexus between transit and bike/pedestrian travel – draw this out



- *Goal 6: Safety and Security*
 - Consider: “Public transportation feels safe, is safe, and contributes to emergency response and disaster resilience”
 - Everyone feels safe – this is an important idea – it has a strong link to equity concerns
 - There are lots of concepts in one sentence - recommend breaking it into multiple sentences
 - Should resilience/emergency management become its own goal?
 - Suggest changing the language around resiliency to be less “techy”

Group 3 report out on Goals 7, 8, 9, and 10:

- *Goal 7: Environmental Sustainability*
 - Minimize environmental and health impacts
 - Use reduction of GHG emissions (not just tailpipe)
 - Ensure sustainable options (not just low-emission vehicles – too prescriptive)
 - “by providing” gets to policies...avoid the “how” and stay with the “what”
 - Delete “contribute to state/local goals” – make more outcome-oriented
- *Goal 8: Land Use*
 - Land use is a tool in shaping communities
 - land use should remain its own goal area
 - Include suburban communities
 - Don’t define regions as just urban or rural
 - After efficient add “effective”
 - Efficiency is defined differently according to context
 - Create collaboration between public transportation and state/local governments
 - Important to emphasize “collaboration”
- *Goal 9: Strategic Investment*
 - Consider making it Goal #1
 - “Achieve (or optimize) sustainable and reliable funding,” as opposed to “pursue” – strengthen language



- “By providing increased access...” doesn’t fit in this goal statement – delete the sentence in that has to do with accessibility
- Move last sentence to the beginning
- Clarify that public transportation is not just projects, it’s also operations and service, which require sustained funding levels to be maintained
- Achieve funding that meets demand
- Emphasize investments that cross jurisdictional boundaries
- *Goal 10: Communication, Collaboration, and Coordination*
 - Broaden the scope to cover other states - coordinating with neighboring states
 - Change “transit” to transportation in first sentence; change to “Public transportation and private providers”
 - Consolidating public transit information at a statewide level to transit providers is important
 - Move second sentence to the goal area on accessibility
 - 2nd sentence - 1st part gets into how, need to talk about what
 - Make sure the statements are outcomes-based (e.g. “ensure people know how to use the system”)

The PAC agreed that the project team revisions should ensure user-friendly language, avoid subjective terms (e.g. “important”), and emphasize outcomes. All goals should use outcome-based language.

White Paper on Private Providers

Ryan Farncomb, consultant team, reviewed the findings from the private provider research conducted for the plan, which the PAC requested at a prior meeting. After presenting on findings and key trends, he asked the PAC to discuss:

- What trends do you think are most important to address as we work on the plan?
- Which findings present the greatest impact or opportunity for Oregon as a whole?
- What did we miss?

PAC discussion followed:

- Private providers can link and coordinate
- The plan should focus on a 20-year timeframe and should capture innovation
- All providers should complement each other, but avoid duplication



- There is still not enough service even though there might be duplication – need to be careful
- There is potential to max out roadway capacity by using new technology (e.g. self-driving cars)
- There are private non-profits as well as for-profit entities (e.g. Ride Connection)
 - For-profit need to make money; service could change over time, leaving gaps
- Need to determine what is appropriate to have as statewide vs. local policy
 - Partnerships are often formed at the local provider level
- Identify what the state should be doing to take advantage of private provider options
 - Provide 15 good ideas – what are the opportunities?
- Are there regulatory limits, either federal or state, that create barriers in existing policy?
- Policy implications can lead to policy solutions

Ryan asked that PAC members email the project team with any further comments; this will not be the last opportunity the PAC has to discuss this topic.

Public Comment

Commissioner Lohman opened up the meeting to public comment. There was no public comment.

Wrap Up and Next Steps

Kirsten reviewed next steps, which include revising the vision and goals for discussion at the next PAC meeting, and preparation for the Fall listening meetings and online open house.

Commissioner Lohman thanked the members for participating in the process and attending the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned. **The next meeting will be on Monday, August 22, 2016.**

Items for Follow-Up	Responsibility
Send PAC Existing Conditions, Benefits of Public Transportation, public involvement summary, white paper on private providers to review during the outreach period	ODOT
Revise vision and goals based on PAC input	Project team
Send additional thoughts on private providers to Lucia	PAC

