



Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**

Date/time: Friday, April 28, 2017 | 9:30 a.m. to noon

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chairman
Karen Buehrig
Joanna Valencia
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Judith Gray
Nancy Kraushaar
Katherine Kelly
Don Odermott
Eric Hesse
Dave Nordberg
Michael Williams
Phil Healy
Tyler Bullen
Heidi Guenin
Glenn Koehrsen
Patricia Kepler

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
Cities of Wilsonville and Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
Cities of Hillsboro and Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Kelly Betteridge
Alan Lehto
Jon Makler

Affiliate

TriMet
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Rachael Tupica
Charity Fain
Alfred McQuarters

Affiliate

Federal Highway Administration
Community Representative
Community Representative

Guests Attending

Zoe Monahan
Talena Adams
Kari Schlosshauer
Radcliffe Dacanay

Affiliate

City of Tualatin
Oregon Department of Transportation
National Safe Routes to School Partnership
City of Portland

Metro Staff Attending

Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Tyler Frisbee, Policy and Innovation Manager
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner
Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Investment Areas Project Manager
Grace Cho, Associate Transportation Planner

Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Ken Lobeck, Senior Transportation Planner
Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, Administrative Specialist II

1. Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chairman Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. and declared a quorum was present. Member introductions were made.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Retirement of Dennis Mitchell, Chair, TransPort committee (Chairman Kloster)** Chairman Kloster announced the retirement of ODOT’s Dennis Mitchell with acknowledgement of some of his contributions as engineer and Chair of TransPort, a subcommittee of TPAC. Mitchell, with 36 years of service, coordinated and managed projects implementing regional plans, specifically the 2010-2020 Transportation System Management and Operations Plan. Mitchell was also credited with the initiation of ITS in ODOT projects.

With Mitchells’ retirement, TransPort will need a new Chair. The Chair of TPAC makes decisions in forming subcommittees such as TransPort, and reviewing bylaws. With bylaw reviews pending, ODOT and Metro came up with an interim solution of co-chairing TransPort, spreading the work between Jon Makler and Ted Leybold.

- **Announcement of 2018-21 MTIP Public Comment Period Open From 4/24-5/23 (Grace Cho)** Grace Cho announced the 2018-2021 MTIP public comment period is open until May 23. Ms. Cho reported that the public comment survey is online at oregonmetro.gov/MTIP, and that at the next TPAC meeting she will be presenting highlights and more information from the program.
- **Comments from Committee Members.** Eric Hesse reported on the improvements with the current Morrison/Yamhill MAX line project that while causing some delays downtown will have benefits for transit riders in the future.

Glenn Koehrsen mentioned that autonomous vehicles was missing in materials and asked if future plans for this would be discussed. Koehrsen was also concerned at not seeing senior issues with transportation access addressed. Chairman Kloster reported that Tyler Frisbee would follow up on these matters at next TPAC meetings, and he would check with Kim Ellis on these issues in the RTP strategies.

3. Citizen Communications on Agenda Items

There were no comments.

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes for March 31, 2017

Discussion: Glenn Koehrsen asked for a correction to the wording on page 3, agenda item 5, second paragraph to read “Lehto will confer with Lobeck on description wording for negotiation”, replacing “medication”.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of March 31, 2017 with this edit.

Moved: Glenn Koehrsen Seconded: Dave Nordberg

ACTION: With edit, motion passed. Two abstaining: Heidi Guenin and Eric Hesse.

5. 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendment – Resolution 17-4798

Ken Lobeck presented Resolution 17-4798 requesting a TPAC approval recommendation of the resolution to PACT, enabling the new projects and required cost/scope changes to occur in the 2015-18 MTIP, allowing final approval to then occur from USDOT.

There are 16 projects listed, with required changes to include:

- Eight projects involve required cost increases in order to continue proceeding through the federal transportation process
- One project involves a significant scope change with full phase programming being accomplished
- The remaining projects involve various changes including project name change revisions, description modifications, and/or are part of project splitting or combining actions.

Lobeck further described the formal amendment public notification requirement in progress, and additional amendment details in the staff report. Lobeck reported on the cost effects with the projects and work with ODOT leading to TPAC becoming proactive in getting progress made on the projects currently. No fiscal constraint issues are with the amendment; cost increases are addressed by local agency funds, lateral fund shifts of existing programmed federal funds, and OTC has approved the ODOT projects verifying these funds are available.

Staff recommends TPAC approval on the resolution, which proceeds to JPACT on May 18, 2017 as a consent item on their agenda, public notification completed as of May 26, 2017, final approval from Council expected early June, 2017, and final review from ODOT and USDOT during June 2017 and final approval by mid July 2017.

Discussion from members:

- Don Odermott pointed out the grammar correction in the resolution, second page, paragraph 5, “Whereas, the City of Wilsonville need to add additional funds to their Tooze Rd.”, (eliminate the duplicate to the in this sentence).
- Nancy Kraushaar asked for consideration with clarification on the funding description with Project 16: Tooze Rd: 110th Avenue – Grahams Ferry Rd. (Wilsonville). Kraushaar pointed out that \$7 million more is the local funding reserved from the last eight years, not federal funding which completes this project. Lobeck agreed to reword this in the resolution to include the full right of way with the project and construction phase that completes the project allowing the project to move forward, with local funding as noted.

MOTION: To approve Resolution 17-4798 with the grammar correction and reflecting clarification notes from discussion held regarding cost increases to funding with project 16: Tooze Rd., Wilsonville.

Moved: Nancy Kraushaar

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

ACTION: With grammar and clarification rewording edits, motion passed.

Question: Don Odermott asked if the motion included the recommendation to JPACT. Since it did not, this was added as an amended motion:

MOTION: To approve and recommend to JPACT Resolution 17-4798 with the grammar correction and reflection rewording of cost increases to funding with project 16: Tooze Rd., Wilsonville.

Moved: Nancy Kraushaar

Seconded: Don Odermott

ACTION: With grammar correction, clarification on funding edits, motion passed.

6. Powell-Division Transit and Development Project Locally Preferred Alternative – Draft Resolution – 17-4776

RTP Ordinance, Division Transit Project – Ordinance 17-1396

Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara presented information on the Powell-Division Transit and Development Project, with request to forward the recommendation to JPACT the adoption of the Division Transit Project LPA Resolution 17-4776, and the RTP Ordinance 17-1396.

The locally preferred alternative (LPA) defined the mode (bus rapid transit), route (downtown Portland to downtown Gresham), and approximate station locations. Local jurisdictions have adopted the LPA to date. Mros-O-Hara reported that Metro would approve the same resolution in this process. Following her last presentation at TPAC, there has been a public comment period and input from partners that helped shape the LPA project, which also involves a required amendment to the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan.

Mros-O’Hara recognized the contributions of the many partners and Steering Committee members for their support with the project. Goals with the project went beyond transportation, and included with equitable housing, community development, safety and active transportation elements. A challenge was identified when the project did not extend to Mt. Hood Community College. Project partners created a Memorandum of Understanding between TriMet, MHCC, Metro, Gresham and Multnomah County to create enhancements to Line 20 to accelerate better connections to the college, and design work for a future transit facility at the campus.

The City of Portland conditions of approval included many community desires:

- Metro to advance Powell for regional consideration for high capacity transit
- Community engagement
- Affordable Housing Investment Strategy
- Economic Development and Business Mitigation
- Transit Service Enhancements
- Memorialize conditions in an MOU

Public and Partner Comments:

- OHSU testified in favor and expressed preference for the project to cross the Tilikum Crossing bridge
- Partner comments focused on clarification
 - How a Powell project would move forward
 - Text edits to emphasize planning project context
 - Timing of prioritizations and definitions of priorities

Metro addressed the comments:

- Revisions to how Powell Boulevard is addressed within the documents
- Revisions to direct that the RTP maps be updated as part of the 2018 RTP update instead of updating them in the 2014 RTP
- Clarification on the role of mobility corridors in the planning process
- Providing additional context on how the Powell Boulevard corridor will be considered as part of the 2018 RTP update and the Regional Transit Strategy

The edits in response to these comments included:

Powell Project:

- Powell would be advanced for Corridor Refinement Plan in the financially unconstrained project list
- Corridor Refinement Plan would study appropriate context-sensitive solutions for all modes
- Prioritization of this project would occur as part of the 2018 RTP Update

Clarification of Planning Context

- Added language reflecting EMCP, Outer Powell Safety Project, MHCC MOU
- Clarification of mobility corridors as a planning unit Maps
- Ordinance stipulates that 2014 RTP maps will be updated as part of the 2018 RTP process Project Lists
- Project lists will be updated to reflect the LPA in financially constrained list
- Edits to show financial constraint
- New Powell Corridor Refinement Plan will be on the unconstrained list

Mros-O'Hara provided a projected timeline for adoption of the resolution with anticipated Metro Council action on June 1. With ongoing design, environmental review and federal funding process, and regional input, construction on the project is planned from 2019-2021, and the start of the new transit service will begin in the fall of 2021.

Mros-O'Hara requested TPAC recommend to JPACT approval and recommendation to Metro Council for adoption the Division Transit Project LPA Resolution and the RTP Ordinance amending the 2014 RTP.

Discussion:

Karen Buehrig asked for clarification on page 3 of resolution 17-4776, 3rd paragraph that ends with “and to designate the Powell Boulevard corridor as a Mobility Corridor recommended for study in a future corridor refinement plan.” Buehrig asked what the difference was between a mobility corridor and high capacity corridor. Mros-O'Hara responded that Metro uses mobility corridors to define large units of land with land use planning, including transportation but much more. In the resolution, the mobility corridor would be used to identify needs and possible solutions, with future analysis of what would make sense in the broader picture for corridor refinement.

Chairman Kloster added that mobility corridor have federally required rules with reporting elements, land use driven, elevated from the 2010 RTP to what is being developed for the future. Refinement planning studies transportation measures and needs further definition. He will bring more information to the committee on Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) regarding refinement planning and definitions of mobility corridors Metro works with in planning structures.

Katherine Kelly commented clarifying to JPACT these distinctions between mobility corridor and refinement planning in relation to 2018 RTP. Initially Gresham had concerns about the mobility study with prioritizing this issue, but have since held discussions that addressed the issue and feel confident the 2018 RTP process will cover it. To clarify the Powell study not identifying safety thus far, Gresham is working through the process with the 2018 project. Kelly asked that the Gresham transit center design to include MHCC in future design planning be more explicit as part of the negotiations.

Tyler Bullen asked to what extent of this project, in regard to outer Division, a phased approach for BRT, given missing right of way and center turn medians. Mros-O'Hara responded that this was the initial start of the process. They have learned a lot with the process and continue to develop the plan. They are discussing plans to make bus lanes priorities where congestion is heaviest, giving longer green lights

for bus transit, faster boarding times in outer Division, and coordinating with the City of Portland on a new safety study.

Judith Gray reported that she was happy with the project and cooperation with agency partnerships. Recognizing that final details can take a lot of effort to complete projects, she was pleased that this cooperation is resulting for the good of the region. Eric Hesse added that he was appreciative of the efforts also. He looked forward to continuing conversations to meet future needs with regional transit.

Glenn Koehrsen mentioned narrow streets located in inner Division and asked how buses can still get there. Mros-O'Hara agreed that this area is challenging for buses, with the community more inclined to a streetcar environment. Plans are for buses to stop at integrated areas with sidewalks, for a lighter treatment of the street and area.

Heidi Guenin was glad to hear of the interest from members, and invited them to attend further meetings to share their thoughts on the project. The issue with right way and turn areas will continue to come up, with the need to address the alignment mode plan. Guenin is also grateful for the time and effort by everyone with this project.

Guenin asked if the language in the Locally Preferred Alternative resolution need be Powell Division Corridor. She was concerned about listing "Powell Division Transit" with the resolution, and "Division Transit Project" with the RTP Ordinance. Mros-O'Hara responded that the titles provided consistency with tracking purposes, matched the preferred local strategies, and have been adopted as such with our partners. Division Transit Project is also approved by FTA for the project.

Phil Healy what the travel time's studies showed, assuming 35 mph east of 82nd Avenue. Mros-O'Hara responded that preliminary studies showed little difference, since bus speeds were not consistently running at 35 mph. Travel time savings were shown at 15-20% savings with new service; a relative savings time.

Katherine Kelly added to the discussion on naming the project, and asked this be clarified for JPACT. She reiterated that safety needs in Gresham were not part of the context of discussion when the focus of the Powell project was transit. Further discussion with a mobility corridor in Gresham can include safety transit issues.

MOTION: (A two part motion made together). Recommendation that JPACT adopt and endorse Metro Council adoption of the Division Transit Project LPA Resolution, and the RTP Ordinance amending the 2014 RTP.

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Seconded: Heidi Guenin

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

7. 2018 RTP: Building The RTP Investment Strategy

Kim Ellis presented information on the 2018 RTP: Building the RTP Investment Strategy. Ellis requests consideration of recommendation to JPACT on the process for updating and evaluating the region's near and long term investment priorities. The recommendation discussion was held in three parts.

Part 1: 2018 RTP Policy Framework and Vision Statement. Ellis directed members to Attachment 1; Summary of 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Framework, and Attachment 2; Excerpt from 2014 Regional Transportation Plan, in the packet for this discussion. Ellis provided an overview of the RTP

project timeline, challenges to the region's economic prosperity and quality of life, adopted plans RTP policy goals that will serve as a foundation and guide updating the RTP investment strategy.

Key elements of the RTP policy framework are:

- A vision for the region's transportation system that reflects community values, regional challenges, and desired land use, economic, equity and environmental outcomes;
- Eleven supporting goals and objectives and related performance targets; and
- A network vision and supporting policies that along with the regional mobility corridor framework guide planning and investment in each part of the regional transportation system to provide a seamless and fully interconnected system.

The committee discussed revisions to the Shared Vision Statement. TPAC discussed the purpose of the additional language that MPAC suggest be part of a mission statement. TPAC recognized the importance and value of having succinct, accessible language to describe the RTP. TPAC's discussion recognized that the bulleted list of outcomes and strategies are important and are already reflecting in the RTP goals and objectives but did not reflect a mission statement.

Jon Makler suggested the following rewording of RTP Policy Framework, supporting policy to the vision, page 9 of attachment 1, Arterial and Throughway Network Map Vision, to read, *"Build a balanced well connected network of road facilities that provide reliable mobility and safe access especially for pedestrians and bicycle trips consistent with each facility and classification."*

Chris Deffebach suggested deleting "In 2040" with the draft vision statement, as RTP plans are continually moving forward to new planning horizons. The mission bullets should be more on how we achieve the goals for the vision. Deffebach commented on how policies and visions seem to populate RTP a lot, which feels redundant. Creating a public version that summarizes these items could be a benefit. She agrees that our Arterial and Throughway vision doesn't truly articulate throughways needs. It was suggested we draw attention to reducing bottlenecks that address how we'll achieve this vision, with an asterisk at the bottom to show updates to this system.

Eric Hesse commented on the number of goals and policies, with a desire to reduce redundancy. Hesse asked if this document was going out to the public soon. Transparency points need to be clear. Ellis responded that staff will begin reviewing the policy framework goals and strategies to flag possible updates for the Policy work group to review and discuss later this year. There is time to make refinements.

Nancy Kraushaar asked about the various maps dated RTP 2014. Were these maps to be used with the Call for Projects for 2018? Ellis clarified that these are the current adopted regional system maps, and any projects listed with the Call for Projects need to be included on this system. Kraushaar asked if amendments to maps are planned. Ellis explained the maps would be part of the policy review work, and that jurisdictions could identify potential amendments to the maps as they identify project priorities to submit during the Cal for Projects. The system maps are intended to show the general location and function(s) of facilities on the regional transportation system for all modes. If a priority project is not currently designated on a RTP system map, a jurisdiction should work with Metro staff to determine whether an amendment to designate the facility is appropriate.

Don Odermott referred to the Regional System definition missing collectors with the arterial facilities and bridges. Ellis responded that collectors were not designated in the RTP system unless they were

identified as industrial areas or 2040 centers. This was a major change adopted during the 2010 RTP update. Odermott and Ellis will confer later as a follow up to this question.

Chairman Kloster suggested we add “subject to update” to the language in Attachment 1 as materials are finalized for consideration by JPACT. Eric Hesse believed our main three points to JPACT are the new vision, three levels of evaluations, including a project-level evaluation pilot and a recognition that the policy framework will be further updated during the next phase. Jon Makler questioned moving forward with Call for Projects when policies are still being defined. As an example, Makler suggested the current “Throughways and Arterials” policy statements did not reflect the region’s approach to addressing bottlenecks.

Katherine Kelly suggested that our message to JPACT is that the 2014 RTP Policy Framework will serve as a starting point to guide the Call for Projects, acknowledging our policies and projects will need refinement as we move through the process. Ellis added that the policy work group will be convened this year, with their draft recommendations on potential policy refinements expected this fall. She further explained that the technical evaluation would inform additional policy refinements. As we start with adopted RTP policy framework we can build and refine our policies once more is known.

Nancy Kraushaar asked for consideration renaming Attachment 2 to be titled “*2014 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Framework*” to be used as the baseline for further review with 2018 Policy Framework. Eric Hesse added that he considered this work plan what was under discussion for approval now, in draft mode, with further updates to be discussed. Evaluations such as equity measures and tests would be added into performance measures once known later.

As a result, TPAC recommended the bulleted list not be included in the vision statement or policy framework as a mission. Instead, TPAC recommended the following language serve as a starting point for summarizing what the RTP aims to achieve in public information materials:

Together our investments will support local and regional land use goals and plans and connect everyone to a range of housing choices and education, services and work opportunities of today and the future.

Together we will create a transportation system that:

- *Is well-maintained and fiscally sustainable*
- *Is safe and accessible for all ages, abilities and modes of travel*
- *Adapts to emerging technologies*
- *Manages both demand and capacity effectively*
- *Reduces pollution and protects our climate*
- *Moves our products to market efficiently*
- *Is ready for natural disasters*
- *Seamlessly interconnects rail, aviation, marine, highway, major street, bus, biking, and walking services and facilities.*

MOTION: To recommend to JPACT the revised vision and mission statement with TPAC comments to include using the adopted 2014 RTP Policy Framework as the baseline for further refinements and updates to the plan, reflecting MPAC revisions and using the mission strategies in the Call for Projects process:

RTP Vision Statement: In 2040, everyone in the Portland metropolitan region will share in a prosperous, equitable economy and exceptional quality of life sustained by a safe, reliable, healthy, and affordable transportation system.

In addition:

- **RTP Goal 9 more explicitly prioritize equity in areas where people are most impacted by gaps in infrastructure, forwarded to RTP Transportation Equity work group to identify potential refinements and future discussion and consideration by policy advisory committees.**
- **Recommends the RTP Policy Actions work group review goal 11 (Delivery accountability and transparency) to more explicitly call out the transparency in the decision making process, to review with all RTP goals.**
- **Recommend updates to attachments 1 & 2 to more clearly reflect the attachments come from the adopted 2014 RTP and are intended to serve as a starting point to guide building the RTP Investment Strategy.**
- **Recommend staff review and refine RTP policy chapter in 2017-18 as part of moving forward, including:**
 - **Review of RTP goals and objectives, particularly the safety, equity and accountability goals**
 - **Review of performance targets to meet federal and state requirements**
 - **Review of modal policies and maps, particularly the throughways/arterials, transit, and freight networks**

Discussion: The committee agreed that the motion should include a footnote on page 9 of the Policy Framework addressing the network visions and supporting policies as part of the policy review.

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Part 2: 2018 RTP Evaluation Framework. Ellis directed members to Attachment 3; 2018 RTP System Evaluation Measures to be tested in summer 2017, and Attachment 4; 2018 Regional Transportation Plan DRAFT Project Evaluation Pilot and Criteria Proposal for Testing. Ellis reported that the evaluation framework includes updated system performance and transportation equity measures and draft project evaluation criteria identified for testing through the analysis of the draft RTP Investment Strategy. The evaluation framework will be subject to further refinement based on the pilot. The Performance work group will be asked to identify potential refinements to recommend to TPAC and MTAC based on issues found during the pilot. The updated criteria would then be applied to projects by lead agencies as part of the 2nd round of analysis next year.

Ellis added that part of the recommendation asked at this meeting with the pilot project evaluation process was for larger agencies to select five projects that cost \$10 million or more and that are likely to seek federal, state or regional funding to Level or above, and then pick one for testing. Smaller jurisdictions will pick just one project for testing at a smaller funding level. Investments will be evaluated to show how well they align with RTP goals:

- System-level evaluation (all projects)
- Transportation equity analysis (all projects)
- Pilot project-level evaluation (small number of projects)

The process for building the RTP Investment Strategy timeline June 1-July 21, 2017 is round 1: Call for Projects. During Summer-Fall 2017 system performance, transportation equity and pilot project

evaluations will occur. November-December 2017 there will be a review analysis of findings and recommendations. January-April we will prepare a final draft strategy for public review. Safety, transit and freight strategies continue to be developed on parallel tracks and will be informed by the analysis findings and recommendations.

Discussion to identify further changes to the pilot project evaluation process and draft criteria was held. Judith Gray presented comments from PBOT on proposed project criteria. Overall, they support ODOT's April 14 work session recommendation to add negative points when a project reduces progress toward an outcome. Under Air Quality and Climate Change, they recommend adding "congestion pricing projects" (those with HOV or no SOV capacity increases) to the list of projects eligible for 7 points. And adding "protected bicycle facilities" (not just new facilities) to list of projects eligible for 7 point lists.

Under Freight and Goods Movement, they recommend adding an option for "Freight Priority" to get the projects eligible for highest score in each category.

Under Readiness and Cost-Effectiveness, they are concerned that "readiness" is proposed for more points than "cost-effectiveness." Building two cost effective projects may provide substantially more benefit than building one "ready" project a year earlier. They recommend switching the score so "cost-effectiveness" is eligible for 7 points and "readiness" for 3, to encourage more cost effective projects.

Under Transportation Safety, they feel projects using multiple proven countermeasures and/or higher effectiveness measures should get a higher number of points. They recommend rewriting this to show projects with higher impact, and a higher number of countermeasures, scoring more points.

Under Travel Options, Transportation Resiliency, they recommend adding "or provides access improvements to emergency locations" after "fixes a seismic deficiency" to recognize that some operational improvements can improve disaster and emergency response.

Don Odermott asked what types of negative points would hurt projects. Gray responded that it might appear in the outcome that while the project gained results in one way, they also hurt other outcomes that benefited communities. It was also questioned if we had parameters for this measurement. Ellis responded that with our current timeline, it was recommended to allow the Performance work group to address this aspect as part of refining the draft criteria as a follow-up to the pilot.

Katherine Kelly commented that with congestion pricing projects, they not be listed specifically tied to funding measures such as tolls or taxes. She also felt that protected bicycle facilities and new bicycle facilities were one and the same. Don Odermott supported the extra credit on points with bicycle facilities.

Don Odermott commented at not seeing the Freight Bottleneck report criteria that showed ODOT facilities only as eligible. Ellis responded that this list has been expanded to reflect intermodal system with tiered expansion and importance given to arterials and first mile/last mile connections to intermodal facilities. Nancy Kraushaar added that Freight industrial areas really need this support with points in their projects. Much will be learned from the pilot phase.

Eric Hesse asked for clarification on the air quality and climate change point "C", in regard to bus service emissions using diesel, and if this was to structure earning or decreasing points. It was agreed to structure both reductions to gain points, with further discussion to set this.

Chris Deffebach commented on the amount of criteria to be considered prior to the pilot projects, and if we were comfortable with the details to this point. Judith Gray commented that she supports the points discussed thus far were good for the pilot evaluation. Ellis added that this recommendation to JPACT would be for categories only at this point, leaving revised criteria yet to be evaluated. Karen Buehrig added that as a pilot program, we need to start with the baseline. She suggested another workshop be held in the fall with larger groups, to further discuss the measures and what was learned from the pilot evaluation.

MOTION: Recommendation that JPACT support moving forward with testing the updated RTP Evaluation Framework, including the pilot project evaluation process. In addition:

- **Recommend PBOT refinements considered as part of reviewing and refining the draft criteria this fall – post pilot. The RTP Performance work group, TPAC and MTAC discussions will help identify potential refinements to the project evaluation criteria and project applicability to address any challenges and shortcomings identified through the pilot.**

Moved: Jon Maker

Seconded: Judith Gray

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

With meeting going beyond the scheduled time, a quorum count was taken. With a quorum in attendance, meeting continued.

Part 3: 2018 RTP Investment Strategy Funding Framework. Kim Ellis, Ken Lobeck, Ted Leybold and Tyler Frisbee presented information on the draft financially constrained forecast and overall investment strategy funding levels. Ellis was asking for a recommendation to be forwarded to JPACT to accept the draft financially constrained revenue forecast capital funding targets for use during the RTP Call for Projects, (acknowledging the draft financially constrained forecast will likely need refinement in 2018 to reflect local, regional, federal and/or state funding discussions or actions that occur before the RTP is finalized for adoption), and recommend an overall funding level to assume for the 2018 RTP Investment Strategy for purposes of the Call for Projects.

Asked what JPACT will be presented with, Ellis reported that a simple table showing the summary version of draft funding targets on constrained revenue forecasts. In addition, a short memo with description of the draft RTP financially constrained revenue forecast.

Ken Lobeck presented information in the table titled “Summary of Proposed Capital Revenues Funding Targets for 2018 TRTP Call for Projects”. Revenue Programs (column 1) were explained with their funding use, 2018-2027 amounts, funding targets with eligibility, and totals. Chairman Kloster added that this funding review would continue through the RTP Call for Projects, with more funding information known at later dates.

Don Odermott thanked everyone for their hard work on this. Odermott is concerned that Hillsboro has many collector projects in the RTP project list and that are assumed in the draft revenue forecast for Hillsboro that don’t seem to be covered under the regional system and network policy definitions discussed earlier. In the past the RTP has covered collectors and arterials, but questions if their current revenue with this plan will cover it.

Phil Healy asked if the Port was included with the City of Portland draft revenue forecast. Lobeck replied that they are listed a separate entity. Their projects cover many different revenue streams making it

harder to identify which is for transportation. Lobeck will further study this and confer with Healy and other Port staff to prepare a draft forecast for the Port of Portland.

Karen Buehrig commented on the guidance of the coordinating committee's role with Call for Projects and each jurisdiction reporting on specifics to the forecast regarding the 3 funding buckets. She commented on how jurisdictions are being asked to balance out with unknowns at this point, but when complete forecasts are known a better evaluation is possible. The timeframe for responding to the Call for projects is challenging for jurisdictions given the uncertainties. She estimated that with the assumed 2014 RTP \$15 billion constrained funding, we are now projecting this at \$9 billion. This equates to a 1/3 less funding for projects. Buehrig also estimated that the most reduced in the local/state/federal revenues total was local, which makes it challenging, and highlighted the need to communicate this with jurisdictions in terms of what it means for project planning. Buehrig also acknowledged that longer forecasts require more flexibility.

Joanna Valencia commented on page 3 of the 2018 RTP Constrained Revenue Forecast handout, with tables showing proposed capital funding target methodology. She was concerned with methodology based on population, especially regarding HSIP and Connect Oregon. Ken Lobeck stated that this is how past RTP forecasts have addressed discretionary funding for purposes of the Call for Projects.

Judith Gray reported that her preference was to extend the timeline for Call for Projects for more effectively dealing with forecast revenues, but that she understood that presented future timeline challenges. She would like to see an alternate approach with an adequate timeline to review the funding. Gray suggests changing "draft forecast" to "preliminary forecast", since the time has not adequately been given for a full review. She believes these funding forecasts will require review and adjustment, resulting in a huge impact on what our regional planning is now, especially if reducing funding by 1/3 of past revenues. It also carries a large impact on agency and jurisdiction workloads and their Call for Projects. Gray also suggested creating another column in the HSIP-L Proposed Funding Targets Table, which would provide funding documentation for larger projects as a way for tracking these, as needed.

Chris Deffebach commented that her jurisdiction would need the additional time between this meeting and JPACT to review the forecast. She would like to see funding targets placed in context with local/state/federal dollars, compared to the 2014 assumptions, so that jurisdictions can better understand the potential impacts of the new forecasts. Chair Kloster agreed on having the funding presented in context, and showing the value of strategic funding for the limited dollars for projects.

Tyler Frisbee presented information on additional priorities project list, or could be called Strategic priorities list. This was defined as:

- Aspirational – reflects what we want and need to build but don't have the funding for right now
- Projects where we want to know how they impact the system, prepare them for construction, keep them in our back pocket for future planning and project development to advance
- Based on projected comparisons to transportation funding raised by peer regions across the country

In response to Gray's comments on identifying separately large funding projects, Frisbee stated that other regions/cities provide a study or comparison for funding toward these project. Providing the extra column for projecting funding is possible, but needs development. This is one option to be considered.

What JPACT has indicated they would like to see is more grounding to explain the funding amounts more clearly.

To provide context with peer region financially constrained funding increases in a 10 year period:

Portland, OR	Per-Capita Per-Year Amount: \$477	Rough increase over financially constrained	N/A
Salt Lake City	\$586		22%
Seattle, WA	\$657		37%
LA, CA	\$700		47%
Previous RTP Approach (150% of Financially Constrained)			50%

Karen Buehrig commented that she was looking at this in the context of the Call for Projects, not in the context of the full RTP. She suggested looking at the possibility of asking for a 200% increase to help compile the draft list of projects for the RTP, then use the project evaluations to inform getting to a 150% list of important projects that we still wish to include.

Jon Makler agreed with the rationalization of working with a 200% increase as a starting point. He recommends a focused analysis of investment in the region with transportation spending as opposed to other elements of funding. This could provide a base for future forecasts moving forward.

Don Odermott commented on how we might get the private sector more involved with increased funding for transportation. He encouraged another meeting where Frisbee could report on how other regions/cities report on their private investments for transportation.

Glenn Koehrsen commented that this material needs to be simplified for the context of the individual voter and what it means for them. While recognizing the RTP document has to meet specific federal requirements, the language, purpose and financial terms could be better presented for simplification.

MOTION: To recommend to JPACT the acceptance of preliminary draft financially constrained revenue forecast for use during the RTP Call for Projects, double the draft constrained revenue forecast to set an overall draft RTP Investment Strategy funding level for purposes of the Call for Projects and set sub-regional capital funding targets (based on the draft forecast and funding level recommendation) for purposes of the Call for Projects.

- **This recommendation acknowledges that the preliminary draft financially constrained forecast will require review and adjustment in 2018 to reflect local, regionally, federal and/or state funding discussions or actions that occur before the RTP is finalized for adoption.**
- **This recommendation reflects that despite having less funding available, the region continues to significant transportation needs that if left unaddressed, threaten the region's economic prosperity and quality of life.**
- **The effect of doubling the preliminary draft forecast to set an overall funding level for the Call for Projects means that the total draft RTP Investment Strategy would be sized to approximately \$18 billion (e.g., Draft Constrained forecast equals \$9 billion and Draft Strategic Priorities list equals \$9 billion for a total draft RTP Investment Strategy of \$18 billion).**
- **This was to be identified as a starting point based on what is known now and subject to change. County coordinators and agencies would agree to these terms as funding information is presented and discussed.**

Moved: Jon Makler Seconded: Phil Healy

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

8. 2018 RTP: Regional Transit Strategy

This item was tabled until the May 26, 2017 TPAC meeting.

9. 2018 RTP: Regional Freight Strategy Plan

This item was tabled until the May 26, 2017 TPAC meeting.

10. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:40 p.m.

Meeting minutes respectfully submitted by,



Marie Miller
Planning and Development, Metro

Attachments to the Record, Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee meeting, April 28, 2017:

Item	Topic	Document Date	Description
1	Agenda	4/28/2017	April 28, 2017 Meeting Agenda
2	TPAC Work Program	4/21/2017	TPAC Work Program as of 4/21/2017
3	Handout	4/17/2017	Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee Acronyms List
4	Meeting Minutes	3/31/2017	TPAC Draft Minutes from March 31, 2017
5	Draft Resolution 17-4798		Draft Resolution 17-4798 for the Purpose of Amending the 2015-18 MTIP to Modify and/or add New Projects as part of the April 2017 Formal MTIP Amendment
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 17-4798		Exhibit A to Resolution 17-4798
7	Memo	4/24/2017	Memo: Staff Report for April 2017 MTIP Formal Amendment plus Approval Request Resolution 17-4798
8	Memo	4/21/2017	Recommendation of Locally Preferred Alternative Resolution and RTP Ordinance for the Powell-Division Transit and Development Project (Division Transit Project)
9	Handout		LPA Adoption Schedule and General Schedule
10	Handout	4/10/2017	Summary of public comments on Resolution No. 17-4776
11	Handout	4/12/2017	Table of Contents: LPA and RTP Amendment Materials
12	Staff Report	4/12/2017	IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 17-4776, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE POWELL-DIVISION TRANSIT AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECT'S DIVISION TRANSIT PROJECT LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
13	Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 1	4/12/2017	Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 1
14	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2a	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2a
15	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2b	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2b
16	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2c	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2c
17	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2d	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2d
18	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2e	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 2e

19	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 3	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Resolution No. 17-4776 Attachment 3
20	DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 17-4776	4/12/2017	DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. 17-4776
21	DRAFT Resolution No. 17- 4776 Exhibit A	4/12/2017	DRAFT Resolution No. 17-4776 Exhibit A
22	DRAFT STAFF REPORT IN CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 17-1396	4/12/2017	DRAFT STAFF REPORT IN CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE NO. 17-1396
23	DRAFT Staff Report Ordinance No. 17-1396 Attachment 1	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Ordinance No. 17-1396 Attachment 1
24	DRAFT Staff Report Ordinance No. 17-1396 Attachment 2	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Ordinance No. 17-1396 Attachment 2
25	DRAFT Staff Report Ordinance No. 17-1396 Attachment 3	4/12/2017	DRAFT Staff Report Ordinance No. 17-1396 Attachment 3
26	DRAFT Ordinance No. 17- 1396	4/12/2017	DRAFT Ordinance No. 17-1396
27	DRAFT Ordinance No. 17- 1396 Exhibit A	4/12/2017	DRAFT Ordinance No. 17-1396 Exhibit A
28	DRAFT Ordinance No. 17- 1396 Exhibit B	4/12/2017	DRAFT Ordinance No. 17-1396 Exhibit B
29	Memo including Attachments 1-10	4/21/2017	Building the 2018 RTP Investment Strategy – RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED
30	Memo	4/24/2017	2018 RTP Project Evaluation Pilot and Revised Draft Project Criteria
31	Memo including Attachments 1-5	4/20/2017	Regional Transit Strategy draft policy framework and vision
32	Handout	Fall 2016	2018 Regional Transit Strategy
33	Memo including Attachments 1-5	3/22/2017	Regional Freight Strategy Update
34	Presentation	4/28/2017	2015-18 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) AMENDMENT – RESOLUTION 17-4798
35	Presentation	4/28/2017	Powell-Division Transit and Development Project LPA Resolution and RTP Amendment
36	Presentation	4/28/2017	2018 Regional Transportation Plan Building the RTP Investment Strategy
37	Memo	4/27/2017	4/26 MPAC refinements to RTP Policy Framework
38	Memo	4/27/2017	PBOT Comments on 2018 RTP Project Evaluation Pilot and Revised Draft Project Criteria
39	Handout	4/28/2017	2018 RTP Constrained Revenue Forecast Call for Projects Targets

