

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

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

Date/time: Friday, September 7, 2018 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Margi Bradway, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Nancy Kraushaar
Katherine Kelly
Don Odermott
Jeff Owen
Phil Healy
Glenn Koehrsen
Beverly Drott

Affiliate

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

Alternates Attending

Jessica Berry
Eric Hesse
Jon Makler
Lidwien Rahman
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

Multnomah County
City of Portland
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Joanna Valencia
Mark Lear
Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Carley Francis
Rachael Tupica
Tyler Bullen
Alfred McQuarters
Maria Hernandez
Emily Lai

Affiliate

Multnomah County
City of Portland
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative

Guests Attending

Garet Prior
Dave Roth

Affiliate

City of Tualatin
City of Tigard

Metro Staff Attending

Ted Leybold, Resource & Development Mgr.
Kim Ellis, Senior Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Grace Cho, Associate Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Tyler Frisbee, Policy & Innovation Manager
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Eliot Rose, Senior Technology Planner
Frankie Lewington, Associate Public Affairs Specialist

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

Chairperson Margi Bradway called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was declared with committee members asked to display their name cards in lieu of introductions.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (SWRTC) Plan Update** (Lynda David)
Ms. David presented information on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Clark County, WA. Like Metro, the 2018 update takes the current 2014 plan as its basis and information and data is being refreshed and added, with the ultimate goal of identifying transportation needs for the next 20 years.

Part of the 2018 RTP update is focused on existing transportation system performance and forecasting future performances to year 2040. Transportation system management, operations and demand management are part of the plan. Ms. David noted they are increasing their bus transit system, bus rapid transit (BRT), the bus on shoulders pilot program on SR14 and increasing bus on shoulders to I-5 and I-205 corridors.

Anticipated adopting of the RTP is expected in early 2019. Complete information on the plan is available at the RTC's website: www.rtc.wa.gov/programs/rtp/clark/update/ More details are planned to be presented in early 2019 at a TPAC meeting.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items - None

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from August 10, 2018

Corrections made to the minutes of August 10, 2018:

Page 2, Comments from the Chair, second paragraph, add "*effectiveness*" to read "...for ways to maximize costs *effectiveness*."

Page 5, second paragraph, last sentence to change "*declining*" to read "....as travel time is *increasing*"

Page 6, second bullet, add the line "*Presentations are requested to be printed and placed with packets at meetings*"

MOTION: To approve the minutes from August 10 as corrected.

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed with three abstentions: Nancy Kraushaar, Chris Deffebach and Karen Buehrig.

5. MTIP Formal Amendment Resolution 18-4912

Ken Lobeck provided an overview of the September 2018 Formal MTIP Amendment and Request for Approval of Resolution 18-4912, for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) involving 10 projects impacting King City, ODOT, Portland and TriMet.

1. Project: OR99W: SW Royalty Parkway - SE Durham Rd (King City)			
Lead Agency:	King City		
ODOT Key Number:	18807	MTIP ID Number:	70769
Project Description:	On OR99W near King City, fill sidewalk gaps to connect the City to OR99W corridor to increase access to transportation, improve travel options, promote vitality within the town center and enhance overall livability		
What is changing?	The cost increase to the project primarily impacts the construction phase. The increase is due to higher than expected construction bids being received.		
Additional Details:	The cost increase does not reflect a change in scope. However, the project will complete a construction phase re-bid process as the original bid was rejected. The original bid came in at 56% over the project engineer's final assessment. A further project review determined the construction phase will need an additional \$262,000 to cover the expected higher costs for the construction phase. The lead agency has committed the extra funds to the project and the construction phase is still planned to obligate by the end of FFY 2018.		
Why a Formal amendment is required?	The cost increase to the project of \$250,000 for the construction phase represents a 21.9% cost change to the project and exceeds the 20% threshold for cost changes that can occur via an administrative modification		
Total Programmed Amount:	The total project programming amount increases from \$1,141,019 to \$1,391,020		

2. Project: I-5: Interstate Br (NB) Trunnion Shaft Replacement			
Lead Agency:	ODOT		
ODOT Key Number:	19651	MTIP ID Number:	70832
Project Description:	Replace trunnion shaft; bridge #01377A. ODOT is lead on project with WSDOT paying 50% of total.		
What is changing?	This amendment is primarily a corrective action to the MTIP and STIP for project. The Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase budget and construction phase required increases to their existing programmed amounts. The updates were made as part of the 2018 STIP Update, but not passed on to the MTIP until now. The earlier cost projects were preliminary and the current increase represents updated phase costs. The increase is primarily a corrective action so the MTIP and STIP are balanced again for the planned construction phase obligation which is being advanced to occur before the end of 2018 without issue.		

Additional Details:	<p>The current MTIP and STIP programming for the project total is currently \$13,317,136. This amendment increases PE from \$2,568,00 to \$2,980,495. The Construction phase increases from \$10,749,136 to \$13,475,269.</p> <p>Along with the cost increase the construction phase has been advanced through a previous administrative modification allowing the construction phase to obligate before the end of FFY 2018. This amendment also formally corrects the construction phase year of obligation based on the expected final phase obligation totals.</p>
Why a Formal amendment is required?	The revised total project cost is \$16,445,764 and represents an increase of \$3,128,629 which equals a 23.5% cost increase to the project. This is above the 20% threshold for administrative modifications for \$1 million of greater project costs.
Total Programmed Amount:	Total programming increases from \$13,317,136 to \$16,445,764 and is advanced from 2019 to 2018.
Added Notes:	Separate OTC approval was not required as approval for the cost increase occurred as part of the 2018 STIP Update.

2018-2021 Active STIP			MULTNOMAH			2018-2021 Active STIP		
Name: I-5: INTERSTATE BR (NB) TRUNNION SHAFT REPLACEMENT						Key: 19651		
Description: Replace trunnion shaft: bridge #91377A. Oregon Department of Transportation is lead on project with Washington Department of Transportation paying 50% of total.						Region:		
MPO: Portland Metro MPO			Work Type: BRIDGE					
Applicant: ODOT			Status: PROJECT SCHEDULED FOR CONSTRUCTION					
Location(s)								
Mileposts	Length	Route	Highway		ACT		County(s)	
308.00 to 308.65	0.65	I-5	PACIFIC HIGHWAY		REGION 1 ACT		MULTNOMAH	
Current Project Estimate								
	Planning	Prelim. Engineering	Right of Way	Utility Relocation	Construction	Other	Project Total	
Year		2015			2019			
Total		\$2,568,000.00			\$10,749,136.00		\$13,317,136.00	
Fund 1	01HD	\$1,294,000.00			01HD	\$5,374,568.00		
Match								
Fund 2	2030	\$940,467.90			2001	\$4,822,599.07		
Match		\$54,032.10				\$551,968.13		
Fund 3	2001	\$528,658.35						
Match		\$80,541.65						
Footnote:								
Most Recent Amendment Approved								
Amendment No: 15-18-2365					Approval Date: 8/31/2017			
Reaggregated Action: Increase funding for the preliminary engineering phase.								

3. Project:	I-405: Fremont Bridge I-405:Fremont Bridge to US26 WB connection bridge (Portland)
Lead Agency:	ODOT
ODOT Key Number:	19533
	MTIP ID Number: 70836
Project Description:	Replace modular joints and repair decks. Replace modular joints and repair decks. The US26 westbound connection bridge will receive a deck overlay to seal the cracks and provide additional cover for the reinforcement; a rail retrofit, and leaking joints will be addressed.
What is changing?	The amendment combines the construction phase funding and scope elements from Key 20482 into this project. As a result there is a significant scope update and limits adjustment which require a formal amendment through the combining action. Additionally, the construction phase obligation is planned to occur by the end of FFY 2018. This amendment acts as a corrective action for auditing purposes ensuring the STIP and MTIP match up with the final PE and construction phase obligation amounts.
Additional Details:	The work to be done on project K20482 is nearly identical in design effort and is in proximity to K19533. Therefore, there is an opportunity to combine the two projects to allow cost savings in traffic control, public affairs, design time, and contract management (overhead).

	<p>In addition to the scope combined from K20482, we need to add a new bridge to the STIP location list, bridge #09268E, which was accidentally left out during prior programming. This is what is triggering the formal amendment.</p> <p>Project location sites now include the following MP locations:</p> <table><tr><th>Route</th><th>MP Begin</th><th>MP End</th><th>Distance</th></tr><tr><td>I-405</td><td>3.57</td><td>to 4.00</td><td>0.43 miles</td></tr><tr><td>I-405</td><td>3.64</td><td>to 3.77</td><td>0.13 miles</td></tr><tr><td>I-405</td><td>3.78</td><td>to 3.98</td><td>0.20 miles</td></tr><tr><td>I-405</td><td>2.61</td><td>to 3.07</td><td>0.46 miles</td></tr><tr><td>I-405</td><td>1.47</td><td>to 1.67</td><td>0.20 miles</td></tr><tr><td>US-30</td><td>1.03</td><td>to 1.45</td><td>0.42 miles</td></tr><tr><td>US-30</td><td>1.40</td><td>to 1.52</td><td>0.12 miles</td></tr></table>	Route	MP Begin	MP End	Distance	I-405	3.57	to 4.00	0.43 miles	I-405	3.64	to 3.77	0.13 miles	I-405	3.78	to 3.98	0.20 miles	I-405	2.61	to 3.07	0.46 miles	I-405	1.47	to 1.67	0.20 miles	US-30	1.03	to 1.45	0.42 miles	US-30	1.40	to 1.52	0.12 miles
Route	MP Begin	MP End	Distance																														
I-405	3.57	to 4.00	0.43 miles																														
I-405	3.64	to 3.77	0.13 miles																														
I-405	3.78	to 3.98	0.20 miles																														
I-405	2.61	to 3.07	0.46 miles																														
I-405	1.47	to 1.67	0.20 miles																														
US-30	1.03	to 1.45	0.42 miles																														
US-30	1.40	to 1.52	0.12 miles																														
Why a Formal amendment is required?	The updated scope element is significant enough to warrant the project combining action to be processed as a formal amendment. The scope adds bridge #09268E through the combining action. A major change in the project scope triggers the need for a formal amendment.																																
Total Programmed Amount:	The total project programming amount increases from \$21,200,000 to \$22,954,542																																

4. Project: I-405 NB to US26 WB Over I-405 Connection Bridge	
Lead Agency:	ODOT
ODOT Key Number:	20482
MTIP ID Number:	70974
Project Description:	Deck overlay to seal the cracks and provide additional cover for the reinforcement. Rail retrofit. Address leaking joints.
What is changing?	The construction phase scope and funding are being combined into Key 19533. There exists overlapping scope for both projects and the combining effort provides a better and extended use of available funding. The PE phase obligated in 2017 will be left programmed but change to be a prior obligated project. Key 20482 will be removed during the next MTIP & STIP Update
Additional Details:	
Why a Formal amendment is required?	The combining effort results in a significant scope update which warrants the need for a formal amendment
Total Programmed Amount:	By shifting the construction phase funding to Key 19533, the total project programming decreases from \$1,548,226 to \$5,641

5. Project: HSIP 2016 Signalized Improvements (Portland)	
Lead Agency:	ODOT
ODOT Key Number:	19722
MTIP ID Number:	70853
Project Description:	Upgrade signal heads to a larger size. Install reflectorized back plates and countdown pedestrian signals. Replace illumination with LED fixtures.
What is changing?	The amendment reflects a cost decrease due to a scope revision. Given the age of existing signal infrastructure at several locations, the City required a structural analysis to determine whether larger signal heads could be supported by the existing poles. Their consultant performed as much analysis as possible without foundation as-built, steel materials testing, and/or geotechnical investigation, all


	of which would have substantial costs associated that the City is not prepared to take on at this juncture. The signal elements in question are being removed from the project and as a result the funding is being reduced.
Additional Details:	<p>The goal of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) program is to achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The HSIP program requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads that focuses on performance. ODOT and Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) staff developed a list of projects on city streets that met the HSIP criteria. ODOT awarded a grant for the HSIP 2016 Signalized Intersection Improvements program to PBOT in the amount of \$2,572,162.</p> <p>Intersections with traffic signals that require a new reflectorized back plate (RBP) were revised to account for the installation of an entire new 12"-12"-12" signal head with RBP, rather than just a new RBP. This is due to the input provided by ODOT based on prior HSIP installations in Gresham and Washington County. Those local agencies found that connections between signal heads and back plates and signal heads and poles vary by age of equipment and manufacturer and may be irreplaceable due to damage and wear to the aging equipment. Replacing entire signal head and connections helps to guarantee the replacement of the signal heads when a contractor is on-site. Doing this reduces costly change orders and down time for the project. The only exception to the above is northeast 122nd avenue and northeast Shaver street which was recently rebuilt with modern equipment.</p>
Why a Formal amendment is required?	The scope change results in a cost change to the project of \$630,329. This represents a 23.7% cost change to the project which is above the 20% threshold for allowable cost changes via an administrative modification
Total Programmed Amount:	The project's total programming decreases from \$2,659,191 to \$2,028,862
Added Notes:	OTC approval was required and occurred during their August 16, 2018 meeting

6. Project: HSIP City of Portland Bike Ped			
Lead Agency:	Portland		
ODOT Key Number:	19723	MTIP ID Number:	70840
Project Description:	In Portland at various locations complete bike/ped safety improvements including pavement markings and signs, Pedestrian refuge island, curb extensions and rapid flash beacon.		
What is changing?	A scope change is now occurring at the intersection of 148th and Division requiring curb extensions, and at the intersection of Division Street and 124 th /125th which now will include a full signal. This results in a \$424k cost increase to the project. The city obtained the required added funds to cover the construction phase increase. The amendment provides the updated final construction phase obligation amounts to FY 2018 for auditing purposes.		
Additional Details:	<p>Various locations are being removed from the scope of work for the project. Since safety funds are allocated by site, the federal funding associated with these locations is also being reduced.</p> <p>Remaining locations are receiving upgraded signals, which leads to a cost increase in Construction. The other source of the cost increase is the fact that PBOT updated their anticipated unit price for the signals due to recent bid quantities coming in high.</p>		

Why a Formal amendment is required?	The project increases by \$424,220 to address the construction phase shortfall which equals a 23.8% cost change to the project. The cost change is above the 20% threshold for \$1 million dollar or greater projects where cost changes can be accomplished by an administrative modification
Total Programmed Amount:	The project total programming increases from \$1,782,126 to \$2,206,346

7. Project: Marine Drive Path: NE 112th Ave - NE 185th Ave			
Lead Agency:	Portland		
ODOT Key Number:	14409	MTIP ID Number:	70063
Project Description:	Construct three segments of and off-street path and one segment of an on-street path with signal crossings		
What is changing?	The amendment reflects a cost increase primarily to the construction phase. The cost increase results from the Army Corp's requirements for the retaining wall and an recently updated cost estimate (adjust for inflation and current demand issues) which replaced an earlier engineer's cost assessment. The project was authorized to obligate the construction phase before the end of FFY 2018. This amendment provides the final obligation corrections for MTIP auditing and accounting requirements.		
Additional Details:	Per the PCR: Due to several changes in bid quantities due to requirements from the Army Corps of Engineers, the construction phase estimate significantly increased. Also, design budget requirements increased due to delays and extensive reviews by the Army Corps of Engineers. The city of Portland will be adding \$373,616 in local funds that can be used for PE and address the construction phase funding shortfall.		
Why a Formal amendment is required?	The total project programming increases by \$373,616 which represents a 34.7% cost change to the project. This exceeds the 20% threshold for cost changes that can occur as an administrative amendment.		
Total Programmed Amount:	The total project programming increases from \$1,076,563 to \$1,450,179		

8. Project: OR99W/Barbur Blvd Area: Sidewalk Infill Projects			
Lead Agency:	Portland		
ODOT Key Number:	TBD – NEW PROJECT	MTIP ID Number:	TBD
Project Description:	In Portland at multiple locations near and around OR99W (SW Barbur Blvd), complete sidewalk infill projects (Replacement Project Grouping Bucket for Key 19298)		
What is changing?	<p>Key 19298, OR99W: SW 26th Ave – SW 19th (Portland) is an existing city project that was intended to build missing gaps in the sidewalks and bike lanes, and make enhancements to existing intersections along SW Barbur Boulevard. The project is a Metro funded project through the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) program. The project was awarded \$1,794,000 of Metro Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds from the 2016-18 RFFA call.</p> <p>However, ongoing development and refinement of the SW Corridor Plan identified a future conflict with the city’s project along Barbur Blvd. The Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project is a proposed new 12-mile Metropolitan Area Express (MAX) line from downtown Portland through Tigard, terminating near Bridgeport Village in Tualatin.</p>		

	<p>The new line would be a major new spoke in the Regional High Capacity Transit Network</p> <p>As proposed, the alignment potentially would be in conflict with Portland's Key 19298 project. Metro and Portland examined possible project scope changes and workarounds. However, nothing feasible emerged. Rather than redact the funding, Metro offered Portland the chance to develop a replacement project in the same area with the same basic scope of work. The agreed replacement project will be the OR99W/Barbur Blvd Area Sidewalk Infill Projects (project grouping bucket) now being programmed through this amendment.</p> 
Why a Formal amendment is required?	Per the approved FHWA/FTA MTIP/STIP Amendment Matrix, adding and/or canceling a project in the MTIP requires a formal amendment
Total Programmed Amount:	The total project programming will be \$1,938,487. The funds originate from the canceled project in Key 19298.

9. Project: OR99W: SW 26th Ave - SW 19th (Portland) (Canceled Project)	
Lead Agency:	Portland
ODOT Key Number:	19298
MTIP ID Number:	70676
Project Description:	This project will build missing gaps in the sidewalks and bike lanes, and make enhancements to existing intersections along SW Barbur Boulevard.
What is changing?	Through this formal amendment, the project is being canceled. All funding is being transferred to Portland's OR99W/Barbur Blvd replacement project also part of this amendment bundle
Additional Details:	See discussion in project #8 above explaining the reason why Key 19298 is being canceled.
Why a Formal amendment is required?	Per the approved FHWA/FTA MTIP/STIP Amendment Matrix, adding and/or canceling a project in the MTIP requires a formal amendment
Total Programmed Amount:	Key 19298 programming goes from a total of \$1,999,331 to \$0 as the result of the formal amendment.

10. Project: TriMet Mass Transit Vehicle Replacement (5307)	
Lead Agency:	TriMet
ODOT Key Number:	21362 - NEW PROJECT
MTIP ID Number:	TBD

Project Description:	Replacement of 2 mass transit vehicles. This project will be delivered through FTA.
What is changing?	This formal amendment adds a new project for TriMet to the 2018 MTIP. The replacement transit vehicle purchase originates from ODOT's discretionary grant award program. TriMet has been awarded 2 mass transit vehicle replacements. The final grant awards were approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission during their May 2018 meeting.
Additional Details:	<p>The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Rail and Public Transit Division (RPTD) conducts periodic discretionary grant solicitations. For the July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2020 biennium, several federal funding sources were used to conduct discretionary project solicitations, with the majority of the approximately \$15 million recommended grant awards being awarded for capital items in three separate categories.</p> <p>Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program: Funding comes from the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. The FTA allocates funds to states in separate rural (less than 50,000 population) and small urban area (50,000-199,999) allocations. For this solicitation, RPTD offered program funding of \$1.7 million for public transportation services provided in rural areas. Eligible projects for this solicitation included operations, mobility management, purchased service and preventive maintenance for transportation providers serving seniors and individuals with disabilities in rural areas.</p> <p>Bus and Bus Facilities Program: RPTD offered \$8.5 million in funding for replacement and expansion of vehicles, facilities, equipment, signage and shelters for transportation providers in small urban and rural areas and for Mass Transit District vehicle replacement, using a mix of FTA funds and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).</p> <p>STP Vehicle Replacement Program: As part of the 2018-2021 STIP, the Commission awarded RPTD \$5 million per year for three years beginning in 2018 to replace transit vehicles for which ODOT is the security interest holder on the vehicle title.</p>
Why a Formal amendment is required?	Per the approved FHWA/FTA MTIP/STIP Amendment Matrix, adding and/or canceling a project in the MTIP requires a formal amendment
Total Programmed Amount:	The total project programming is \$1,076,248
Added Notes:	OTC approval during their May 2018 meeting

Mr. Lobeck reported that compliance requirements and public notification requirements had been met. The timeline was given for providing to JPACT on Sept. 20 and Metro Council on Sept. 20, 2018, following approval of this recommendation by TPAC of Resolution 18-4912.

MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT Resolution 18-4912 which includes ten projects impacting King City, ODOT, Portland and TriMet.

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

6. 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Strategies: Proposed amendments in response to public comments

Chairperson Bradway provided an overview of how this discussion was planned. No motions or actions will be taken. Items for further discussion and clarification in the Draft Appendix C to Ordinance No. 18-1421 (Summary of Comments Received and Recommended Actions) will be weighed in and prioritized by committee members. From discussion today, issue of substance or technical in nature will be identified, clarified for importance, and listed as consent or needing more discussion. At the TPAC October 5 meeting, these items will be further discussed, as needed, before full motions are taken on the recommendations sent to JPACT.

As a starting point, a whiteboard had two categories listing infrastructure objectives and policies, and substantial or technical in nature. There would be a 1st round of committee member input providing their top three items they felt warranted discussion, which would be added to the board. Items should be named with their number to help locate. Clarification was given on staff asking for level of importance with the issues, as to create a '*Table of Contents*' of focus.

Chairperson Bradway and Kim Ellis stressed that while some issues of substance may have agreement for a strong recommendation to JPACT currently, and will be included in the consent items needed no further discussion, the purpose of today's discussion is to identify for JPACT issues that are still being reviewed and may warrant changes before TPAC's recommendations come to them October 18.

Ms. Ellis pointed out the items in the committee packet:

- Cover memo on the process, overview of final public comment period, the adoption process and final steps planned
- Final Public Comment Period Summary – Highlights of comments
- Draft Appendix C to Ordinance No. 18-1421 – Summary of Comments Received and Recommended Actions
- Draft Appendix C Supplemental Metro Staff Recommendations (dated 8/31/18)
- Draft Ordinance on the RTP
- Draft Resolutions on the Strategies

The full version of Appendix C, Public Comments will be placed online, but limited printed copies due to the size of the document. There will be a public hearing in early November. Ms. Ellis requested that comments on any of the material could be sent to her. Asked where responses were made to comments made online, Ms. Ellis reported that staff would be reviewing these and look for specific identified issues that need to be addressed, and include these as part of the final public comment report.

Comments from the committee:

- Lynda David – The main concern looked at was Bi-State travel between OR & WA, and the coordination between the two MPOs, which were well addressed. The draft RTP did well addressing innovative investments and Bi-State value pricing issues.
- Nancy Kraushaar asked to have green infrastructure issues discussed. A question was asked where to locate Appendix F. This was clarified as online with all chapters and appendices.

- Don Odermott noted #58 of the comments that stated “Make walking the most convenient, safe and enjoyable transportation choices for short trips less than three miles”....which he recommends be changed to “under 1 mile or less”.
 - #70 notes that the alignment shown with Cornelius Pass Road does not match the city staff adopted plans
 - #74 lists Brookwood Parkway as a minor arterial, which was challenged by the County for the classification as a critical roadway with TPR implications
 - #193 on the mobility corridor issue in the RTP chapter 8 #16. Mr. Odermott asked for more discussion from the City of Portland and Washington County on the Sunset Mobility Corridor Study.
- Phil Healy asked for more information on the performance standards that Metro is working together with ODOT regarding arterials and freeways in MAP-21.
- Eric Hesse asked for more discussion on #15 with the RTP Pilot Project evaluation with prioritization.
 - #198 in Chapter 8 for more discussion on jurisdictional transfer
 - #135 in Chapter 8 for more discussion on climate findings/documentations
- Jon Makler asked for more discussion on #62 regarding word choice and describing capacity with vehicle capacity.
 - #229 for more discussion linking RTP and MTIP
 - #224 and #225 for more discussion on clarity of investment areas
- Karen Buehrig asked for clarification discussion on Chapter 8, #55, 172, 177 and 178, all regarding the mobility policy update.
 - #106 for more discussion on the Multnomah County Public Health additional information in the comment provided.
 - #186 for more discussion on the removal of green corridor implementation
 - #220 and 221 for more discussion on amendments to project maps
 - #156 and 253 for more discussion on the comments from coordinating committees and commissioners made that don’t require a change in the RTP, but wanting to know what type of action will be made to their comments in response.
- Jeff Owen had no additional comments to note to what had already been stated.
- Jessica Berry asked that checks be added to the green infrastructure discussion and pilot project evaluation program discussion.
- Beverly Drott asked that a check be added to the discussion on the green infrastructure.
- Katherine Kelly asked that a check be added to the discussion on the green infrastructure.
 - More discussion was asked on the mobility policy in regard to including TMSO and RTO programs included in this discussion
 - Consideration of adding “programs” when listing Vision Zero to documents/projects
- Glenn Koehrsen asked that a check be added to the discussion on the green infrastructure.
- Chris Deffebach asked that a check be added to #62 regarding word choice and describing capacity with vehicle capacity.
 - #208 for more discussion on TPR implications and land use decision
 - #197 and 2 other similar items for consistency to responses with scoping on the congestion pricing study
 - #203 for more discussion on adding Basalt Creek Parkway to project list

The meeting took a short break for compilation of notes before reconvening.

The first discussion for more review was **Green Infrastructure**. Eric Hesse asked if staff could provide a brief overview of the strategy proposed with discussion. Ms. Ellis provided locations in documents where green infrastructure was mentioned including new objectives proposed in comments received, new policies in the Draft Appendix C supplemental handout, Policy Chapter 2 of the RTP, Chapter 3 Design section with #6 new design policy focused on resiliency, and definitions of Draft Appendix C. It was added that Table 3.x in Appendix C strategies of potential mitigation were drawn from a number of sources.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig was concerned with adding transportation design policies into the RTP. There appeared not to be much discussion on designed policies beyond natural features, and more time was needed to address safety issues with how it all fit in the RTP. More would be recommended on having a comprehensive restructure to the policies.
- Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on where the new proposed policies on design being added to the RTP were located. Specifically, these were pages 3-38 in the design section of the plan. These are sets of policies that guide each design plan. Clarification was given on objectives in the comment log, goals and policies listed in the RTP. Ms. Deffebach commented on the amount of information to consider without more of due process. Concern was noted on specific policies on broad levels with specific design objectives. References to regional conservation strategies were noted that may not have completed processes and would differ from policies cities have already adopted in Natural Protection Resource Areas and in the functional plan they are already complying for regulations.
- Glenn Koehrsen commented on going too far too fast from a design period standpoint. He suggested careful consideration of the substance and value of each comment provided rather than reference the volume of comments from one organization.
- Beverly Drottar commented that while these issues were not as heavily vetted in the process, they are proposed as policy for consideration in our planning process as are other issues, showing a significant concern from citizens with natural, green spaces.
- Nancy Kraushaar was concerned how this impacts scope of projects. There are already many regulations in place that are followed. It was questioned if all projects in the RTP are subject to Federal regulations. Ms. Kraushaar felt Table 3.x may be overreaching in scope.
- Don Odermott commented that while we all embrace green environment, we need to balance our infrastructure with these policies, keeping it high level while not over descriptive.
- Eric Hesse commented on not seeing the same policy level as with safety and health issues as examples. He suggested more time to work with staff between TPAC and MTAC meetings to work through this discussion.

Climate Smart

Ms. Ellis reported that the per capita reduction of carbon emissions of 40% will be updated in the modeling assumptions and findings in the appendices. They will also be included in the technical reports, consistent with state evaluations. Future federal levels that may change will be included in future evaluations in the modeling assumptions also. Eric Hesse and Chris Deffebach appreciated the

clarification and documentation that help policy makers with investment decisions. Ms. Ellis noted that this information would be updated in the Appendix J draft.

Project Evaluation Projects

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler felt this project process got tabled with not enough time to develop results for inclusion in the RTP. Not enough information shows significantly for the formal record. He proposes the project evaluation projects be eliminated from the appendix.
- Eric Hesse commented on the intent of what is communicated to the public. Ms. Ellis explained that staff proposed we state this project and that it was tabled with the draft criteria used. The initial results provided could be used in combination with other project evaluations in the next RTP. Mr. Hesse agreed on findings from performance evaluations from various projects.
- Chris Deffebach suggested adding this to Chapter 8 as next steps in the process with commitment to continue work on pilot project evaluations. The committee agreed.

Vehicle Policy #62

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler felt the policy was speaking to two issues. One being the capacity to preserve the travel programs we have with recognition that capacity on highways are for certain trips. The second being the recognition that more capacity is needed within the system, but doesn't address what we leave unsupported. Asked where optimized capacity language can be included in the policy that is needed toward shorter trips on freeways, Ms. Ellis responded the language was not meant to preclude capacity preserving freeways for long trips, new or existing. It was possible to include optimize in the language of this policy.
- Jeff Owen referred to page 353 of the RTP, Policy 3 where both "optimize capacity" and "strategically expand" would both be appropriate language in this discussion.
- Don Odermott agreed with Policy 3 language that states preserve capacity for long trips. He recommends keeping the word "preserve" there.
- Eric Hesse recommended that Policy 3 and 4, which had similar language, could be addressed for consistency and reconciled to result in desired outcomes with capacities.

Mobility Policy #55

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig addressed comments from Clackamas County regarding the scope of work developed for the Mobility Policy update. Ms. Buehrig was interested in more clarification on when, where and how jurisdictions could engage in the process since it appeared they weren't able to do so in the scope process thus far. Chairperson Bradway responded that these were early stages with Metro working with ODOT and partners, forming IGAs and working on improved descriptions in the UPWP. The Mobility Policy will likely have the same team of partners but needs more time to gear up to full capacity. Ms. Buehrig added that coming from lessons learned from the RTP process leads us to our Mobility Policy project to begin addressing significant issues.
- Jon Makler asked how we might better address language on these issues at the front of Chapter 8. It appears attention is given to MPO programs including MTIP projects, but the UPWP is

rushed through with lack of consistency on details. Mr. Makler suggested we state at the front of Chapter 8 that the UPWP is a collaborative and comprehensive plan that helps us refine these preliminary scopes of work, with encouragement to engage with our partners.

- Chairperson Bradway commented on the challenge Metro has predicting future directions in resources and capabilities to plans, as both JPACT and Metro Council will have new members this next year. More time needs to be provided before predictable estimates can be made.
- Chris Deffebach asked if more language was needed for clarification about the UPWP and direction completing project scopes. Ms. Ellis provided the following statement from the RTP, page 8-13, "This work will be completed by multiple partners as resources are available and pending future Metro Council and JPACT policy direction." Something that relates to the UPWP could be coordinated to the UPWP annual updates, which Mr. Makler agreed would help define what UPWP partners are committed to and uphold federal process intent and reviews.
- Jon Makler suggested that conversations take place between Metro/ODOT/FHWA to result in clear linkage between UPWP and MTIP.

Sunset Corridor

Comments from the committee:

- Don Odermott referred to a citizen comment suggesting corridor #16 be added to the Sunset Highway, which is Highway 30. The Sunset Highway study mentioned in Chapter 8 already includes several sections with high traffic. Mr. Odermott is concerned with the connectivity and mobility of this corridor if added to Highway 30. Input from Multnomah County and the City of Portland was requested.

Investment Areas #224 and 225

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler commented on work plans lacking details that better defined work programs.
- Karen Buehrig commented on past experience with the difficulty of connecting areas of investment to the projects. Noting RTP page 8-11, it was suggested to better connect planning projects and where they come from to the implementation of the project, related to areas of investment. Coming from the RTP, such as corridor planning work, would allow for definition to connection of the investment group, or other categories.
- Jon Makler suggested adding this into the preamble of Chapter 8. Ms. Ellis added that not all may be from the investment areas, as some have multiple partners on projects. More discussion on defining connections in the RTP to program categories will be made by staff.

Multnomah County Public Health #106

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig commented on additions to a comment from Multnomah County Public Health. Ms. Buehrig believed there was no other comparable information for the other counties on this listed, so the recommendation was not to include the information specifically from Multnomah County. It was suggested to either site the comment, or specify that the comment was not region-wide. Katherine Kelly added there is regional data similar to the statistic stated by Multnomah County. Ms. Ellis will work on the wording for this recommendation.

Green Corridor Implementation #186

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig commented on the identification of Green Corridors as a planning activity that Metro would be working on, coming out of the 2040 Growth Concept. Clackamas County has implemented and adopted policies related to Green Corridors, but is not clear that anything out of this RTP directs the Green Corridor work. Ms. Buehrig recommends the Green Corridor as a planning activity be removed as no clarity is given on regional activity. More discussion was recommended between staff and jurisdictions on the Green Corridor section of the RTP.

Congestion Pricing Scoping

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach referred to several comments regarding congestion pricing, and agreed that when addressing transit demand on the system and how best to meet this demand, broader terms that look at alternatives should be used. Chairperson Bradway commented that alternatives provided a modeling exercise, where congestion pricing was not intended to draw conclusions for implementation.

Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and Land Use Issues #208

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach commented that she would defer to Metro legal advice on this issue. She recommended that minor plans that were not specific to land use actions not be called out, as they may not require a land use decision. Metro legal staff has recommended that all amendments to the RTP are a land use action and will be adopted by Ordinance, meeting federal and state requirements under the TPR.
- Chairperson Bradway added that further discussion on MTIP/RTP and major/minor differences with plan requirements would be provided at future TPAC meetings.
- Lidwien Rahman provided clarification on TPR amendments as only changing project for needs, function, the mode or the general location. The project part in the RTP amendment would only be needed for the same functions.

Basalt Creek Project

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked for definition of major project that currently is defined as over \$500 million. However, the Basalt Creek project falls slightly short of this amount of funding spent, but could receive more federal funding if recognized in the RTP as a major project. Ms. Deffebach noted it was included on the Freight Network also. More discussion will be taken on criteria and definition of funding for major projects.

Mobility Corridors #213 & 214

Comments from the committee:

- Don Odermott referenced comments regarding Mobility Corridors made that addressed sections of Highway 26 and Highway 30, bundling sections of corridors and coordination of planning between sections. Mr. Odermott asked if the City of Portland, Washington and Clackamas County could weigh in on this.

- Eric Hesse stated the City of Portland could agree with the inclusion of corridors that were identified that fit with the intent for coordination. He agreed that sensitivity be used for scoping in areas and would be open for further discussion to help clarify corridor refinement planning.
- Jessica Berry asked if this extension of scope went beyond the sections identified in the Mobility Corridors. It was noted that the MPA boundary was the typical boundary used for identification for plans and on maps, but Cornelius Pass Road noted on maps falls beyond MPA Boundaries. The committee agreed by consent on the comments and staff recommendations for amending in the RTP, but would like to see further discussion on scope and language with Mobility Corridors.

Jurisdictional Transfers #198

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse appreciated the partnership work provided on the subject. He noted that some cases of this issue could occur that may not classify as jurisdictional transfer, and that language be written with correct intent in the RTP for better direction for partners to follow. The scope and level of detail in projects may need more specific language clarification.
- Chairperson Bradway agreed that an overall discussion on this topic is warranted. Stronger language with updates/changes by staff has already begun. This was noted with staff recommendation changes to the language in comment #198.
- Eric Hesse suggested that the amended comment be further changed to read “If a jurisdictional transfer change is not viable or appropriate, jurisdictions may pursue a potential Special Transportation Area designation in collaboration with ODOT.”
- Chris Deffebach added that some roads may not fit as good jurisdictional transfers, but will need investments and priorities for investments.

Jon Makler suggested that a strong preface to Chapter 8 be added noting that before work begins on any of the tasks listed, the scope of these be defined or developed to the satisfaction of the jurisdictions. Chairperson Bradway encouraged additional comments from the committee be sent to Ms. Ellis and Mr. Kloster. Ms. Ellis will update agreed upon additions/corrections by consensus of the committee, map out proposed changes and provide a summary of this discussion before the Oct. 5 meeting. At the Oct. 5 TPAC meeting, the committee will have the opportunity add input to changes before final motions are taken. Appreciation for committee comments and input was acknowledged.

7. 2021-2024 STIP Update – Business Cases and Leverage Opportunities Activity

Jon Makler provided an overview of the development of the STIP business cases and leverage opportunities. 124 projects will be scoped this fall, a number that does not include approximately 20 ARTS applications from local agencies, which will be scoped separately. The projects have been bundled geographically, available in the handouts at this meeting, and shown by map location.

Mr. Makler encouraged cities and counties to participate in ODOT’s scoping “camp” in order to add further information to their scoping details through the upcoming weeks. Each Monday ODOT will host overview sessions of the roughly dozen business cases they will be scoping that week. Wednesday field trips to these projects allows for further input.

Mr. Makler noted there may be some differences between the lists and the online map as ODOT tries to keep the map synchronized. He also acknowledged that, due to timelines, the business cases do not include the leverage suggestions received from local agencies but those suggestions have been received and are being addressed. Mr. Makler acknowledged the work of Mandy Putney flagging the leverage opportunities for scoping leaders before they are set to scope projects. There are protocols with cost estimates that look at base project levels, with and without leverage elements that will need to be sorted out in the next several weeks.

Comments from the committee:

- Jeff Owen asked if the projects that were struck out on the list no longer under consideration. Mr. Makler concurred, as these were bridge projects and not listed further.
- Don Odermott asked if the county representatives were asked to pass this information to their cities, which Mr. Makler agreed and asked for assistance reaching cities in all counties.
- Chris Deffebach asked if the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects were new. Mr. Makler stated that ODOT eligibility provided to have SRTS included in the application process and was used as a soft opening in the process.
- Eric Hesse asked if ODOT was interested in adding new ideas with scoping during this initial process. Mr. Makler would like to have suggested design input and what could be added to future project designs with more information given welcome.

8. Metro Emerging Technology Strategy PILOT Program

Eliot Rose provided an overview of the Metro Partnerships & Innovative Learning Opportunities in Transportation (PILOT) Program. PILOT is a new, one-time competitive funding program to support projects that test new approaches to providing shared, active, or equitable transportation options using new mobility services; collect and share information on project performance, and develop partnerships between organizations to support ongoing success. Pilots have proven to be best practices in transportation planning, because they are more cost-effective ways to get data and develop partnerships than lengthy planning processes.

Mr. Rose noted two key upcoming dates. October 5 will be the PILOT program launch event (all members of TPAC will receive an invitation), where committee members can receive more information and network with potential partners for programs. On September 28 the call for letters of interest opens. There will be a short 3-5 question form for applicants to fill out with information on project purpose, need and solution, project partners, and requests for possible technical assistance with the application process. Further dates with the process were given. Applications open late November, with selection in mid-March 2019. Application awards will be made in June, 2019.

Comments from the committee:

- Jeff Owen thought this was an exciting project and looked forward to having TriMet participation. Mr. Owen asked if additional staff from agencies could attend the launch event, which Mr. Rose encouraged so that potential partnership with projects could be identified.
- Chris Deffebach expressed interest in the program and looked forward to hearing more from the launch event and materials for the letters of interest and applications.

- Glenn Koehrsen asked if there were project categories for seniors and people with disabilities. Mr. Rose reported that part of the PILOT program is to reach broadly that allow for flexibility in projects, to address equity with populations and organizations that help develop ideas on these projects as part of the input for projects. In forming this concept, partners advised a new approach not to be too specific with policy outcomes to achieve technology strategies, but allow for creativity and form strategies that reflect benefits, including different populations, geographic areas and accessibility issues.

9. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chairperson Bradway at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marie Miller".

Marie Miller
TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, September 7, 2018

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	9/7/2018	9/7/2018 TPAC Agenda	090718T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	8/29/2018	2018 TPAC Work Program	090718T-02
3	Handout	N/A	Regional Transportation Plan for Clack County , 2018 Update Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council	090718T-03
4	Meeting Minutes	8/10/2018	Draft meeting minutes from TPAC, August 10, 2018	090718T-04
5	Resolution No. 18-4912	10/29/2018	Resolution No. 18-4912: For the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP program involving 10 projects impacting King City, Portland and ODOT	090718T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 18-4912	10/29/2018	Exhibit A to Resolution 18-4912; 2018-2021 MTIP	090718T-06
7	Memo: Staff Report to Resolution No. 18-4912	10/29/2018	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: Sept. 2018 MTIP formal Amendment & Approval Request of Resolution 18-4912	090718T-07
8	Attachment 1 to Resolution 18-4912	10/29/2018	Attachment 1 to the Sept. 2018 MTIP Formal Amendment Staff Report – Project Location Maps	090718T-08
9	Memo	10/31/2018	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: Metro Staff Recommendations on Public Comments Received on the draft 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (including Projects and Appendices) and Strategies	090718T-09
10	Handout	August 2018	2018 RTP Final Public Comment Period Summary	090718T-10
11	Handout	10/31/2018	Draft Appendix C to Ordinance No. 18-1421: 2018 Regional Transportation Plan, Appendices & Strategies, Summary of Comments Received and Recommended Actions	090718T-11
12	Handout	10/31/2018	Draft Appendix C Supplemental Metro Staff Recommendations to Respond to Public Comments #2, #46, #98, #104 and #105	090718T-12

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
13	Draft Ordinance No. 18-1421	August 2018	Ordinance No. 18-1421 for the purpose of amending the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan to comply with federal and state law and amending the regional framework plan	090718T-13
14	Draft Resolution No. 18-4892	August 2018	Resolution No. 18-4892 for the purpose of adopting the 2018 Regional Transit Strategy and replacing the 2009 Regional High Capacity Transit System Plan	090718T-14
15	Draft Resolution No. 18-4893	August 2018	Resolution No. 18-4893 for the purpose of adopting the 2018 Regional Freight Strategy and replacing the 2010 Regional Freight Plan	090718T-15
16	Draft Resolution No. 18-4894	August 2018	Resolution No. 18-4894 for the purpose of adopting the 2018 Regional Transportation Safety Strategy	090718T-16
17	Draft Resolution No. 18-4869	August 2018	Resolution No. 18-4869 for the purpose of adopting the 2018 Emerging Technology Strategy	090718T-17
18	Memo	10/31/2018	TO: TPAC Committee members and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Associate Transportation Planner and Jon Makler, ODOT Region 1 Planning Manager RE: 2021-24 STIP Update – Business Cases and Leverage Opportunities	090718T-18
19	Handout	August 2018	2021-24 Fix-It 150% Project List	090718T-19
20	Handout	August 2018	Metro Partnerships & Innovative Learning Opportunities in Transportation (PILOT) Program	090718T-20
21	Presentation	9/7/2018	September 2018 Formal MTIP Amendment & Approval Request of Resolution 18-4912	090718T-21
22	Presentation	9/7/2018	PILOT program overview	090718T-22