

Transit Equity Advisory Committee (TEAC)  
Summary Notes  
Thursday, January 15, 2015  
TriMet Office, Columbia Conference Room

In Attendance:

Catherine Ciarlo, Chair  
Joan Brown-Kline, Facilitator  
Jake Warr, TriMet Staff  
Andre Baugh  
Jan Campbell  
Bridget Dazey  
Roberta Hunte  
Ana Meza  
Nicole Phillips  
Consuelo Saragoza  
Daniel Vázquez

**I. Welcome by Catherine Ciarlo, TEAC Chair:**

- Welcome to all TEAC members and guests in attendance.
- Overview of meeting agenda.

**II. Review of 2014**

- Jake provided an overview of TEAC's work and accomplishments in 2014.

**III. Looking ahead to 2015**

- Joan facilitated discussion of whether to (re)establish more subcommittees than the one that has actually met (the Equity Index subcommittee)
  - Roberta asked whether we had a quorum present, to which Catherine responded that we haven't ever formally addressed that issue. Committee decided to move forward with conversation.

- Bridget stated that TEAC's work can be challenging considering TriMet's timelines don't always correlate w/ TEAC's, and that can make things feel disconnected.
- Question of what the key issues are for the next year so we can determine where we need more discussion as a committee.
- Nicole would like to see TriMet use TEAC more. Feeling of not being in the loop as much as the committee could/should be. Feeling of, "Oh by the way, we have to talk to TEAC and here's the information." We've always got info to add. Should be more active input from TEAC.
- Ana stated that the committee more often receives a report/update on what's happening and than creating room for input from committee members. Not as much of a power/voice in order to influence what TM is doing = not making a difference. Subcommittees may be able to get more involved in the agency's work as it's happening, rather than after the fact.
- Roberta mentioned that Planning indicated they would like to be working more closely w/ TEAC or branch of TEAC so that we are actually helping them think about things. Steep learning curve, so asking the entire group to take that on doesn't feel effective.
- Jake posed question about members' time commitment given an overall desire to be more involved.
  - Bridget: depends on the subcommittee and the issue
- Andre: Not every topic needs a subcommittee. Some like eFare need a long-term subcommittee for decisions etc because of how big of an impact it has and to evaluate as it moves forward. It is a time issue, so would need to trade off the time to do a subcommittee. Also, if subcommittees, what does the larger committee do?
- Nicole said she viewed subcommittees as a place to do things we can't accomplish in 2 hours. Then would come back to larger committee for review.
- Catherine asked Jake to address issue of staffing for subcommittees – does TriMet have the capacity?

**\*\*FIRE ALARM INTERRUPTED THE MEETING\*\***

- In response to Catherine's question, Jake suggested that possibly staff from other departments could assist w/ subcommittees, or subcommittees may sometimes meet w/out staff.
- Consuelo asked how TEAC would reconvene under a subcommittee structure, and how decision-making would work.
- **Meeting structure:** Joan offered the suggestion of subcommittees meeting instead of the full committee for the 2<sup>nd</sup> hour of each month's meeting.
  - Discussion of length of meetings, whether to hold in tandem with regular monthly meetings, utilization of technology.

**Decision:** Committee agreed to have subcommittees. Subcommittee chairs will convene groups. TEAC will try this for 3 months to see how it works, beginning with selection of subcommittees by members at February meeting. Subcommittees currently for consideration are 1. Equity Lens, and 2. Fare Policy & Programs (including eFare). Jake and Johnell will bring other focus areas (if any) for 2015 to next meeting.

### III. **Activity: Equity lens scenario application**

- Committee was divided into 2 small groups to walk through King County Equity Impact Assessment Tool and materials from Ottawa’s Equity & Empowerment Lens, given 2 hypothetical scenarios.
- Report out:
  - How functional were the tools?
    - Difficult to apply to the region (seemed more useful if the population was very specific. For a region-wide policy like eFare the King County tool was not as relevant)
    - Hard when it’s several different projects affecting different demographics
  - What did the tools do well?
    - Focused on who benefited and who didn’t. Caused us to see that the program both benefitted and harmed low-income riders. Thus, how can we enhance benefits and reduce harm?
    - Kept us on track, gave us a beginning.
    - Importance of geographic location on the diversity wheel
  - What was missing?
    - Would have been challenging to come up with the data required.
    - Because data is asked for a certain way, tendency to get parts of data and not the full story (assumptions that only race/ethnicity and low-income are areas of focus when other determinants may be just as/more important, i.e. geographic location).
  - Would you recommend these tools?
    - As a starting point to decide what type of model TriMet would use. Provides a broad framework, but may be too location-specific.
  - Other thoughts:
    - Helped enhance understanding of what we’re trying to create with an equity lens
    - Triggered thought processes of what should be considered

- Diversity snapshots could be customized to TriMet riders as well as the region
- Could use a tool on known decisions to see if we come to the same conclusions