



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, March 1, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Don Odermott
Jeff Owen
Phil Healy
Glenn Koehrsen
Jessica Stetson
Emily Lai
Beverly Drott

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Oregon City 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
Community Representative
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Steve Williams
Jessica Berry
Mark Lear
Jaimie Huff
Jon Makler
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Joanna Valencia
Eric Hesse
Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Scott Langer
Rachael Tupica
Jennifer Campos
Tyler Bullen
Maria Hernandez-Segoviano

Affiliate

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

Guests Attending

Garet Prior
Jay Higgins
A.J. O'Connor

Affiliate

City of Tualatin
City of Gresham
TriMet

Metro Staff Attending

Margi Bradway, Dep. Dir., Planning & Dev.
Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Ted Leybold, Project & Resource Manager
Austin Ross, Intern

Daniel Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Cindy Pederson, Manager I, Research Center
Chris Johnson, Research Center Manager
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

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

Chairman Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was called and introductions were made.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Mr. Lobeck presented the summary from the January 2019 Formal MTIP Amendment updates, and the first Administrative Modification bundle submitted during February 2019. These summaries will be provided to the committee on a monthly basis, and shown on the website to show the full year history once the year is completed. Questions on the amendments or process can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.
- **Special Transportation Fund Allocation Update** (Jeff Owen) Mr. Owen reported that since the last TPAC meeting the final slate of projects submitted for various funding sources was submitted by the Special Transportation Fund Allocation Committee (STAC) to the TriMet Board. Upon their recommendations, these were formally adopted. TriMet will now apply to ODOT the recommended allocations of funds as next steps. STAC will meet again to plan an approach with lower threshold of projects if funds are reduced. This information is available on the TriMet website and questions can be directed to Mr. Owen. Mr. Leybold added that any projects with federal funding attached to them would be included in the MTIP, and presented to TPAC at later dates.
- **Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organization Consortium (OMPOC) Updates** (Chair Kloster) Chairman Kloster reported that Metro President Lynn Peterson has added herself to the Portland MPO representation that also includes Councilor Dirksen. At this summer quarterly meeting, Metro will be hosting OMPOC here; with all eight MPOs will gather in Portland. TPAC members and welcome to attend. Advance notice of this will be provided of the meeting.
- **Designing Livable Streets and Trails Announcements** (Lake McTighe) Ms. McTighe provided updates to Designing Livable Streets and Trails projects. Progress is being made on updating original design guidelines. Ms. McTighe referred to the fact sheet handed out at the meeting. There is a TPAC/MTAC workshop meeting scheduled April 17 which will include an agenda item discussing original street design classifications and guideline processes. Then on April 22 a full day event is planned; Policymaker's Forum and Technical workshop on Performance Based Designs. A handout was provided on this event with information. Metro President Peterson, Metro Councilors and guest speaker Beth Osborne, Transportation of America will be presenting at the Forum. TPAC members are invited to attend both forum and workshop sessions. The invitation to RSVP will contain further information and sent soon.

- **New ODOT Liaison Announcement** (Jon Makler) Mr. Makler introduced ODOT's new MPO liaison, Mr. Glen Bolen, who replaces Lidwien Rahman that recently partially retired. Mr. Bolen is not new to Metro as having been a member of staff, along with jurisdictional involvement several years. ODOT appreciated Mr. Bolen's knowledge and wide-ranging experience in the field of planning, and noted Mr. Bolen will be the point person with MPO involvement planning at Metro and our partner agencies and jurisdictions including RTP, UPWP, MTIP and other projects. TPAC and staff welcomed Mr. Bolen to the committee.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items - none

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from February 1, 2019

MOTION: To approve the minutes from February 1, 2019 as presented.

Moved: Phil Healy

Seconded: Jeff Owen

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with two abstentions: Jessica Berry and Glenn Koehrsen.

Consideration of TPAC Workshop Minutes of February 20, 2019 – tabled until April 5, 2019 meeting.

5. **MTIP Formal Amendment Resolution 19-4965** Ken Lobeck presented information on the March 2019 Formal Amendment Resolution 19-4965, that seeks approval of TPAC to send to JPACT amendment to the 2018 MTIP consisting of three projects impacting Gresham, Oregon City and Wilsonville. In summary:

Project #1 Gresham – SE Division Street Improvements

Project Description

- Active Transportation project
- Construct sidewalks and bicycle lanes on each side of Division Street between Gresham/Fairview Trail and NW Wallula Ave.
- Project received a \$100k local project development grant from Metro as part of the 2019 -21RFFA bond proceeds
- Gresham providing \$107k in matching funds
- Funding total = \$207,000

Project Changes

- Adds \$207,000 to the Planning phase to implement pre-NEPA project development activities
- Update project name
- Initiate Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) up to 30% design
- Assist in shortening Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase once funding plan is completed and project moves forward into implementation phases

Project #2 Oregon City – Meyers Rd: OR213 to High School Ave.

Project Description

- Construct 2,100 feet of new Meyers RD between OR213 and west of High School Road
- Add a SB left –turn lane on OR213
- Add 1,400 feet of new NB through-lane on OR213
- Replace OR213/Meyers Rd intersection traffic signal
- Primarily locally funded by Oregon City with a \$250,000 Immediate Opportunity Funds (IOF) State

grant from ODOT.

Project Changes

1. Project is regionally significant
2. Adding the project to the MTIP

Project #3: I-5 Bike/Pedestrian Overcrossing: Barber Street to Town Center Loop

Project Description

- A. Construct bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing over Interstate 5
- B. 2019-21 RFFA awarded project
- C. Upon review with FHWA, determined project could be delivered as a de-federalized project
- D. Metro & Wilsonville completed fund exchange to de-federalize project
- E. Federal funds added to Wilsonville's Kinsman Rd project with local overmatch from Kinsman added to I-5 project

Project Changes

1. FHWA determined project could proceed without federal approvals allowing de-federalization to occur
2. Metro-Wilsonville complete local IGA
3. Project oversight will be through Metro's Local Funding Program
4. Monitored just like any other Metro funded federal project
5. To avoid oversight confusion with ODOT, project is being removed from the MTIP

MOTION: To approve recommendation of Resolution 19-4965 to send to JPACT Formal Amendments to the 2018 MTIP as presented.

Moved: Don Odermott

Seconded: Glenn Koehrsen

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstention: Emily Lai.

6. Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Policy Framework Resolution 19-XXXX

Dan Kaempff presented an overview of the draft 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Policy Statement, with an action request to recommend to JPACT for their consideration and approval. Mr. Kaempff noted updated materials from the Feb. 20 TPAC workshop in this meeting packet. In the presentation Mr. Kaempff noted the policy direction to invest in the region through the 2018 RTP investment priorities: Equity, Safety, Climate Smart, and Congestion.

In January this year, Metro Council provided direction to set RFFA policy framework with these four priorities through RFFA project selection, maintaining the two-step funding framework from previous cycles, and look to better align Step 2 project outcomes with RTP priorities. Input from TPAC and JPACT have been reflected in the updated policy direction presented at the meeting.

Mr. Kaempff presented the draft 2022-2024 RFFA investments as follows:

Step 1: Transit and project development bond commitment	\$68,640,000
Step 1: Region-wide program investments	\$33,080,000
Step 2: Community investments	\$40,000,000
Total 2022-2024 RFFA:	\$141,720,000

Next steps in policy development are JPACT action on policy framework March 21, Metro Council consideration April 4, and then Call for projects opens April 8. The full timeline handout was noted. TPAC is being asked to recommend to JPACT the draft 2022-2024 RFFA policy direction. Chair Kloster

provided an overview on discussion to follow with questions on overall policy first before a motion is made on the policy, with further discussions and amendments made on the motion.

Comments from the committee:

- Glenn Koehrsen, referring to page 1 of the Policy Report under Introductions discussing the priority of Equity, asked if including “underserved” communities could be added. Mr. Kaempff agreed language to include this population can be added.
- Phil Healy was looking for JPACT direction from their meeting summary regarding the focus on sizing freight economic development of the funds. He was unable to find these comments noted. Mr. Kaempff will look for these comments from the JPACT meeting.
- Jeff Owen, referring to page 11 of the Policy Report under Climate Criteria, asked if the intent to improve transit reliability and travel times with transit solutions were addressed to both help meet climate and congestion. This would include enhanced transit concepts (ETC) corridors, which may need to include projects across the region that need further project development and technical assistance worked into the policy. Mr. Kaempff referred to page 10 of the Policy Report that includes the wording “project development will be allowed as an eligible activity for funding...” to indicate these types of project developments are available for funding considerations.
- Karen Buehrig thanked staff for a short timeframe pulling things together, helping provide jurisdictional planning with RFFA funds. Ms. Buehrig asked for clarification on page 6 of the policy report, under “2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Structure”, the last sentence ends with “and to focus funding on parts of the system which do not have dedicated funding streams, or which cannot be legally funded through fuel taxes or other revenue sources.” This appears to be added from past cycles and doesn’t add value to the document with policy direction. Mr. Kaempff reported that the intent of this addition with funds structure was having active transportation important to the region, but that it cannot be used through fuel taxes. Ms. Buehrig acknowledged the regional transportation drew from many sources of funding for programs including trails systems, safety programs with infrastructure and Safe Routes to School programs. She recommended a more broad approach with the description.

On page 8 of the report, different programs are highlighted showing funding allocations to the programs, which were confirmed at increases of roughly 3% over past cycle. It appeared that Corridor and System Planning increased at a higher rate. Ms. Buehrig supports the corridor and system planning, noting Clackamas County now undergoing a Transportation System Study, similar to Washington County. She asked how jurisdictions and TPAC could be more engaged on how funds are spent in corridor planning, and through a broader focus with transportation system planning so that more projects can be brought forward.

Ms. Buehrig appreciated the work on naming criteria, but noted that in previous rounds they were classified as higher, highest, and priority. Currently priorities are not so clear and seem to have lost the ability to see how the criteria was applied. More clarity is needed. It was encouraged to have more time before the next RFFA cycle to review and evaluate RFFA funding. Acknowledging that the policy direction came from Metro Council and JPACT, but TPAC has not had the opportunity to engage with input on these issues, and that many of the issues in RFFA speak to projects 10 years ago. It would help to approach funding in a more forward approach rather than in the past. Mr. Kaempff acknowledged the compressed

timeline than previous cycles, and with more regional projects occurring in the region, the need to develop a more broad conversation with RFFA is called for.

- Mark Lear commented on Commissioner Daily was interested in seeing more clearly in Step 1 and 2 processes that identifies more enhanced and additional priorities. In Step 1 there appears to be a growing awareness that we have smart buses, but dumb signals. More needs to be addresses with these issues in the region. Mr. Lear acknowledged clear language in Step 2 around active transportation and complete streets. However, it was suggested more identified on how these relate to Enhanced Transit Corridors (ETC).
- Chris Deffebach commented on the importance of leveraging funds with the relatively small amount of RFFA funds available. It was hard to see how this was possible in the current list of criteria named. Mr. Kaempff reported that the four areas of focus in the criteria is the base of the application, and having additional questions added. During the first part of April more direction will be provided with the application. A draft review might be possible for the committee depending on schedules.
- Emily Lai asked for information on what defines bond commitments, page 6-7 of the report. Mr. Leybold defined these as payment on a bond schedule that have been committed out to 2034 from prior project analysis. When asked who receives this funding, Mr. Leybold reported that the bulk of the funding went to TriMet for project development. Other agencies received funding for Active Transportation and the bottleneck projects.

Ms. Lai asked how criteria will be used on projects. Mr. Kaempff reported that application responses would show how criteria addressed and/or met criteria. When asked if the committee would have the opportunity to review the questions on the application, Mr. Kaempff reported that he'd attempt to get this draft out prior to the application being open, but the deadlines on this are challenging. Ms. Lai stated she would like to see transportation issues related to disparities and barriers defined in the criteria.

- Jessica Stetson, referring to page 9 of the policy report, said it was not clear how the bullet points on strategic approach to allocating funding included these, but not how they relate to the criteria from RTP focus areas with 4 main investment priorities. It was suggested to include "hot spots" where accidents happen in the region, not specific to high crashes and fatalities. On page 7 of the report, it was suggested to include SRTS in the investments under RTO investments.
- Katherine Kelly suggested further discussion on the merits of retaining the 75/25 split and the intent/purpose of this approach. Page 8 of the report does not include how historically this has been set as president, and should be added. Page 9 of the report states "JPACT and the Metro Council are continuing support for these project focus areas..." Ms. Kelly believes JPACT did not hear or see this discussion from JPACT. The 4 investment priorities from the RTP are where we should be directed. Active transportation funding has been created since the split was created, with further SRTS dedicated funding from HB2017.
- Jon Makler, referring to page 2 of the memo dated Feb. 27 from Dan Kaempff to TPAC, read Metro response from TPAC "Metro Council has expressed their direction to maintain the existing categories." What basis did Metro Council have for making this statement? Did Council receive feedback from TPAC following the Feb. 20 RFFA workshop? Mr. Kaempff reported that workshop feedback had not been provided to Council. In January, the Council gave direction on continuing the split to provide the framework on discussion. Steps in policy direction with current criteria with input have not resulted in any new proposals. JPACT did not

hold a discussion on the matter at their meeting but made the recommendation to stay with the split. At JPACT a slide in the presentation relating to RTP priorities with the split was shown. Margi Bradway encouraged TPAC to develop discussion with JPACT on these issues, knowing the importance for jurisdictional and agency project planning.

Jon Makler stated it was challenging for staff to reconcile these different approaches (75/25 split, RTP priorities and the bullets on page 9 that give strategic approaches to allocating funds. Mr. Leybold reported that the language of the bullets provided the overall structure with projects to achieve with fund allocations. The RTP investment priorities and how they fit in the split are parts of the application with scoring tied to technical questions with criteria categories. The policy direction document is for intent, not to measure technical criteria. Mr. Makler recommended having an amendment to the motion, when made, that TPAC should advise JPACT they feel these risk clouding the policy issues raised without consideration provided by TPAC.

- Emily Lai asked who decides on funding from the applications. Mr. Leybold reported there is a review committee with members of the community, TPAC, ODOT, TriMet and Metro staff, noting that no representatives with projects applying can be among the review group. Following the technical scoring, TPAC recommends the project list, with further input from public comments, then proceeds to JPACT to recommend the project list with funding listed, sent to final approval from Metro Council.

Asked how long equity has been part of RFFA project consideration, Mr. Leybold reported equity has been named as part of the criteria in the past 3 cycles. In the current cycle more refinement has been defined from the RTP update. Asked if a shift in funding is made from criteria changes to show equity, Mr. Lebold reported that how a project is presented and applies to equity considerations is part of the evaluation. Mr. Kaempff added that the technical scores were only part of consideration. Community input can advance project consideration. Mr. Kaempff reported he was confident that people and equity factors were more than foundational in the planned consideration.

- Glenn Koehrsen, referring to page 9 of the report, under recommended approach for developing projects, did not see “first mile/last mile connections” listed. In reading the report it appeared more historic rather than futuristic. Mr. Koehrsen asked if the “first mile/last mile” concept transportation projects would be eligible for funding. If not included on a list with others this might be forgotten. Mr. Kaempff these were only examples named and not meant to be inclusive. These transit connections are important and could be eligible for developing projects.

MOTION: To approve the draft RFFA policy report as presented as recommended to JPACT for their consideration and approval.

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Seconded: Beverly Drottar

Further discussion with amendments made to the motion:

Amendment 1 MOTION: To amend the previous motion to have the RTP investment priorities used as criteria for **step 2, removing the 75/25 split.**

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Katherine Kelly noted that while JPACT included some materials with the split at their meeting, members from JPACT did not have full clarity on TPAC discussion from the previous day workshop and there were differing interpretations of this issue.

Amendment 2 MOTION: To amend the motion to advise the split to JPACT, but with the following accompanying statement. TPAC is concerned with the 75/25 split on how to prioritize among projects while considering among various criteria; RTP priority investments, the split and other priorities listed in the report. Moved: Jon Makler

Amendment 3 MOTION: To amend the motion on page 1 of the report, between paragraphs 2 and 3, that adds language that we need more comprehensive review of the RFFA policy before the next round in order to address the needs of our emerging future transportation system, and to acknowledge that the 2022-24 policy cycle is based on initial JPACT policy in 2009, then amended in 2014-15. This shows policy based on past project planning and funding needs. Moved: Karen Buehrig

Amendment 4 MOTION: To amend the motion on page 6 of the report, remove the last sentence under “2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Structure” that begins with “Through this framework, the region...other revenue sources.” Moved: Karen Buehrig

Amendment 5 MOTION: To amend the motion on page 8 of the report, under Step 2 at the bottom of the page, remove the last sentence that begins with “Per regional policy established....Regional Freight Initiatives categories.” Moved: Karen Buehrig

Amendment 6 MOTION: To amend the motion to include JPACT direction to emphasize economic development for freight projects. This could be added as a third bullet on page 12 of the report, under Construction focus, that would read “Capital projects will focus on economic development emphasizing freight initiatives and freight projects.” Moved: Phil Healy

Amendment 7 MOVED: To amend the motion to include the term “underserved populations” where categories addressing equity is placed in the policy report. Moved: Glenn Koehrsen

Amendment 8 MOVED: To amend the motions to include on page 7 of the report under Regional Travel Options add Safe Routes to Schools, and on page 11 in the Safety criteria, in the purpose statement add “hot spots in the region”. Moved: Jessica Stetson

Amendment 9 MOVED: To amend the motion to include on page 9 an additional bullet under project focus areas, “To ensure a balance between active transportation and economic development throughout projects without means of the split funding method”. Moved: Katherine Kelly

Jon Makler reported the ODOT and the Modeling Steering committee is funding the Household Activity Study/Survey, and toward this:

Amendment 10 MOVED: To amend the motion to allocate the ODOT portion of travel modeling work as part of Step 2 funds as their contribution to regional statewide efforts that support this work. Mr. Makler clarified this to be about \$350,000 funding amount. Moved: Jon Makler

Amendment 11 MOVED: To amend the motion to eliminate the financial split of 75/25 in Step 2, and replace with the additional principal outlined on page 9 that ensures balance between economic development and active transportation.

Note: This replaces the former amendment with new wording. Amendment 9 is withdrawn. Moved: Katherine Kelly

The committee was asked by Margi Bradway to consider the following amendment motions as “friendly amendments”, which were explained as an amendment to a motion under debate that is perceived by all parties as an enhancement to the original motion, often only as clarification of intent.

Amendment 3: To amend the motion on page 1 of the report, between paragraphs 2 and 3, that adds language that we need more comprehensive review of the RFFA policy before the next round in order to address the needs of our emerging future transportation system, and to acknowledge that the 2022-24 policy cycle is based on initial JPACT policy in 2009, then amended in 2014-15. This shows policy based on past project planning and funding needs.

Amendment 4: To amend the motion on page 6 of the report, remove the last sentence under “2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Structure” that begins with “Through this framework, the region...other revenue sources.”

Amendment 5: To amend the motion on page 8 of the report, under Step 2 at the bottom of the page, remove the last sentence that begins with “Per regional policy established....Regional Freight Initiatives categories.”

Amendment 6: To amend the motion to include JPACT direction to emphasize economic development for freight projects. This could be added as a third bullet on page 12 of the report, under Construction focus, that would read “Capital projects will focus on economic development emphasizing freight initiatives and freight projects.”

Amendment 8: To amend the motions to include on page 7 of the report under Regional Travel Options add Safe Routes to Schools, and on page 11 in the Safety criteria, in the purpose statement add “hot spots in the region”.

MOTION: To recommend this document to JPACT for adoption with the above friendly amendments included to this motion.

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Don Odermott

ACTION: Motion passed 15 to 1, Emily Lai opposed.

MOTION: To amend the original motion to eliminate the financial 75/25 split, and include the principal added to ensure a balance between economic development and active transportation investment projects.

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Seconded: Don Odermott

Discussion on the motion:

- Mark Lear felt it was not a good move at this point to make the change. One issue is having recent findings from the RTP showing we are not meeting our goals around complete streets, active transportation networks and other programs. Another issue is having some projects crossover and fall between categories. In order to support these programs to combine possible resources and leverage, a broader discussion needs to be held.
- Jeff Owen commented that from his understanding from JPACT they support the intent of the split, but encourage more project outcomes aligned with RTP priorities.

- Emily Lai commented on the split and how it might be possible to see needed transportation needs met with the active transportation and complete streets funding, the intent to serve the good of the community is not clearly shown.
- Jon Makler encouraged more discussion on these issues. He felt that trying to implement the 4 RTP priorities without the split would allow us to allocate more funds to achieve our goals. We are constrained with the split with lack of flexibility to reach project design fulfillment.
- Don Odermott commented on the low amount of funding with this program, and with the 75/25 split not allowing many ways in which to pick projects that span the region. Mr. Odermott agreed that we need to break down barriers for projects that fit the region.
- Beverly Drottar commented that the committee already approved a friendly amendment to have a more comprehensive discussion on the issue at a later time. If needed with more factored elements to the discussion that this be made later.
- Katherine Kelly appreciated all the comments. Her concern is the split of investments spreads funding thin when projects cover both categories in the split. The intent is to come to more dedicated complete projects and support the 4 investment priorities of the RTP.
- Jessica Berry highlighted an example on page 9 of the report where projects may result in multiple outcomes. It was suggested that one application that serves multiple outcomes over different programs in the split be considered as a whole, rather than have to be limited to one or the other. Mr. Leybold addressed this issue, saying that the split is the policy intent, but having one or more project applications would be given consideration that demonstrate significant outcomes and benefits beyond the primary project purpose.
- Mark Lear noted this split is regional, and encouraged more discussion in the next cycle to find methods to balance out project funding across the region.

Chairman Kloster asked for a vote on the motion.

MOTION: To amend the original motion to eliminate the financial 75/25 split, and include the principal added to ensure a balance between economic development and active transportation investment projects.

In favor: 5 Opposed: 7 Abstained: 2

ACTION: Motion failed.

Chairman Kloster asked for a vote on the motion.

Amendment 7 MOVED: To amend the motion to include the term “underserved populations” where categories addressing equity is placed in the policy report.

Glenn Koehrsen withdrew his motion on this amendment. No vote taken.

Emily Lai commented that issues of racial justice and racial equity have deep impact on transportation related projects. Racial equities need to be clarified in discussions, as they are deeply tied to people of disabilities and populations that are underserved in the transportation network system. Statistics show clearly the varying percentages and need to have these issues clarified. Ms. Lai encouraged more discussion with room to grow and learn, and look beyond active transportation in basic terms of bicycle transportation, where community needs include affordable housing, walking, accessibility to transit and travel time from work and live.

Chairman Kloster asked for a vote on the motion.

Amendment 10 MOVED: To amend the motion to allocate the ODOT portion of travel modeling work as part of Step 2 funds as their contribution to regional statewide efforts that support this work.

Jon Makler felt uneasy calling the Household Activity Survey a capital investment, as part of Step 2. Mr. Makler wanted to amend his motion to read:

Amendment 10 MOVED: To amend the motion to allocate the ODOT portion of travel modeling work, an estimated \$350,000 amount, to Step 1 as a one-time non-capital contribution to the Statewide Oregon Household Activity Survey.

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Chris Deffebach

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstention: Emily Lai.

Discussion on further considerations with motions:

- Jeff Owen asked for consideration of a motion to ask Metro staff to help target funding programmatic to support project development around Enhanced Transit Concepts (ETC) around the region. This would not be a Step 2 capital allocation.
- Margi Bradway clarified that the last allocation to fund ETC technical work was directed by JPACT through bond proceeds, as a one-time funding. Mr. Owen confirmed that TriMet would like to continue these efforts on project development with ETC around the region.

MOTION: To recommend to JPACT continued ongoing funding for project development of ETC projects around the region.

Moved: Jeff Owen

Seconded: Mark Lear

Discussion on the motion:

- Chris Deffebach noted that a section in the Unified Planning Work Plan (UPWP), titled Enhanced Transit Process already covers this issue. How is this different or related to the project development in the region? Chair Kloster added the UPWP has this in the current plan, but it is not named for future years, and not included specifically in either Step 1 or 2. Staff will need to find the location of this program to continue funding.
- Karen Buehrig was concerned how projects will fit in this system without proper time to discuss and consider implications. More understanding needs to be given with corridor system planning, investments projects, the project categories and how the entire regional network is affected with these considerations. Mr. Leybold stated that the corridor planning category, estimated at \$2m was for 3 years ongoing development work with corridors, and roughly \$210,000 system development for regional freight development work, to be then incorporated into Step 1. Asked why corridor planning not placed into these categories, Mr. Leybold reported the ETC project developments were a different focus.
- Jessica Berry felt uncomfortable with adding ETC project development to step 2. In the past, ETC provided no locations in east Multnomah County where frequent service locations for these projects could be placed. Ms. Berry sees the value of the project development but not sure region-wide these efforts are being achieved.
- Don Odermott was concerned about additional projects coming into Step 1, such as ETC project development. With different counties and jurisdictions, concern was voiced on continued disparity of investments that would lead to revenues taken away from providing transit service to underserved populations.
- Jeff Owen appreciated the comments. The intent was to study and develop areas where efforts can help and enhance transit.
- Katherine Kelly reiterated Karen Buehrig's comments.
- Mark Lear commented on challenges to progress with ETC and investments while working with outdated signal systems. There would be too much asked of TSMO programs and current

allocation of funds to plan state of the art for all projects transit at once. A more beneficial approach might be for a regional consensus on planning of investments.

- Chris Deffebach supports the ETC project development, but suggested options of where this might fit. One suggestion was within the UPWP, per Ms. Buehrig's comments. A second suggestion was a potential broad-based grant for the regional system, as part of step 1 to include smart signals. It was noted that a section of HB2017 included enhanced corridor funding as well. There appears to be support for continued funding for ETC planning, but more discussion on methods to fund, leverage and be inclusive of the region is needed.
- Don Odermott commented on the need to have platforms capable to handle smart signals. A consideration was to look at raising the level of technical capabilities to take advantage to get frequent transit service that may not require corridor system planning.

Following discussion:

MOTION: To amend former motion (above) regarding ECT funding, to support smart signal improvements for transit and freight movements recommend to JPACT for continued ongoing funding for project development of ETC projects around the region.

Moved: Jeff Owen

Seconded: Mark Lear

Question on motion: Jessica Berry asked if this was included in step 1 or step 2. No specific step named, but possible step 1 attachment.

In favor: 4 Opposed: 7 Abstained: 4

ACTION: Motion failed.

Chair Kloster if there were any additional amendments or comments.

- Jon Makler asked that this discussion and comments be added to the staff report with materials being presented to JPACT upon the motion of recommendation to JPACT. Margi Bradway reiterated further comments the committee agreed upon for the staff report to JPACT.

Chair Kloster asked for a vote on full bundle of motions that includes

(1) the original motion with

(2) five friendly amendments passed, and

(3) the additional amendment to amend the motion to allocate the ODOT portion of travel modeling work, an estimated \$350,000 amount, to Step 1 as a one-time non-capital contribution to the Statewide Oregon Household Activity Survey, passed.

In favor: 16 Opposed: 0 Abstained: 1, Emily Lai

ACTION: Motion carried.

7. 2021-2024 STIP Fix-It Leverage

Jon Makler provided a fact sheet titled "R1 21-24 STIP Development Fact Sheet – March 2019 Edition. Committee members were encouraged to read this. The second handout provided was the list of 150% scoped projects, titled Region 1 Leverage Opportunities. This is the current state of the list which ODOT believes captures the input from the committee with leverage opportunities to projects. Mr. Makler asked the committee to review the project list for any missing project information.

The third handout were guidelines for the leveraging process: a letter from the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) on process and funding buckets, and ODOT form on STIP criteria for project selection that elaborates on the direction from the OTC. Mr. Makler explained the gray rows in the

spreadsheet that meant a leverage candidate identified. If the row is in white, this project is not identified as a leverage candidate. ODOT is aiming for April 1 to have the 100% project list named. For answers to further questions, please contact Mr. Makler.

8. TransPort Bylaws Draft Review – tabled until April 5, 2019 meeting.

9. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

John Mermin presented an overview of the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) that TPAC has been provided for review. Mr. Mermin presented information on the document organization where projects are described with planning tasks, relation to regional planning activities and budget summaries. TPAC is being asked to review the document and look for opportunities for projects to be better coordinated, add clarity, and identify missing information or narratives in the document.

On March 6 Metro will consult with our federal and state partners, and partner agencies at the annual consultation review. TPAC members are welcome to attend. In the afternoon the consultation continues with the Washington Regional Transportation Council, which TPAC is welcome to attend as well. Next steps in the UPWP process will result with TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council approval with expected final Intergovernmental Agency Agreement (IGA) approval signed by Metro June 30.

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler encouraged TPAC to attend the consultation review meeting if possible. It provides valuable information and details with the opportunities to ask questions.

On page 91 of the UPWP document, under Corridor Refinement and Project Development (Investment Areas), Mr. Makler had questions on how and when these projects are planned, and which corridors come in which order. The level of details on narratives is unsatisfactory. On page 93, regarding major project deliverables/milestones, many items are listed as ongoing, but not listed specifically by quarterly basis where expected descriptions of project outcomes and plans that quarter would be placed. More details are needed in these areas. In addition, it was asked if these projects were all in-house at Metro. This was not clear from the funding sources named.

On page 112 the Regional Freight Delay and Commodities Movement Study was listed. Mr. Makler asked for more specifics on the project regarding scope of work and where this fits in timelines. Mr. Collins confirmed this study came out of work done with the Freight work group that developed freight strategies. The scope of work on the study is still being developed. More will be described to identify freight corridors that provide priorities based on freight needs traveling on freight corridors. It was agreed that updates on this be provided to TPAC at frequent meetings under “Comments from the Chair”.

- Jeff Owen appreciated the efforts made on the document, and encouraged others to attend the consultation meeting on March 6. Mr. Owen will not be able to attend the meeting, but Kelly Betteridge, Manager of Capital Planning will be there representing TriMet.
- Glenn Koehrsen confirmed this document at the meeting is the same version sent in the packet. Only the title page had been edited.
- Karen Buehrig appreciated the improvements made to the document making it more readable and understandable. Ms. Buehrig agreed with the comments from Mr. Makler on Corridor

Refinement and Project Development planning, with need for more details. Minor comments regarding consistency with project to project funding, and which year or years this fall into need to be clarified. These comments will be given to Mr. Mermin directly who can contact the responsible project manager for answers.

- Jessica Berry appreciated the extended time for the committee to review the document this year.

10. Columbia to Clackamas (C2C) Project Overview – tabled until April 5, 2019 meeting.

To the good of the order:

- Jon Makler announced that permission was granted for the second handout provided, the list of 150% scoped projects, titled Region 1 Leverage Opportunities, to be sent out electronically. Following the meeting, this was sent out electronically for larger size font available for easier reading. No magnifying glasses required!
- Chairman Kloster announced that apparently Todd Juhasz was already headed to Redding, CA, so the committee sent him best wishes in his new position there, and enjoyed the cupcakes in his absence.
- Don Odermott announced that a new alternate for Cities of Washington County would be named soon for TPAC. Formal approval is underway for this candidate.

11. Adjourn

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

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, March 1, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	03/01/2019	03/01/2019 TPAC Agenda	030119T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	2/22/2019	TPAC Work Program, as of 2/22/2019	030119T-02
3	Memo	2/21/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: MTIP Monthly Submitted Amendments	030119T-03
4	Meeting minutes	2/01/2019	Draft minutes from TPAC, February 1, 2019	030119T-04
5	Resolution No. 19-49XX	03/01/2019	Resolution No. 19-49XX, for the purpose of amending 2018-21 MTIP, involving three projects	030119T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-49XX	03/01/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-49XX, 2018-2021 MTIP	030119T-06
7	Staff Report to Resolution 19-49XX	03/01/2019	Memo Staff Report to Resolution 19-49XX RE: March 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment plus Approval Request of Resolution 19-49XX	030119T-07
8	Attachment 1 to March 2019 MTIP Amendment	2/21/2019	Attachment 1 to the March 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment Staff Report – Project Location Maps	030119T-08
9	Attachment 2 to Staff Report	1/07/2019	Attachment 2 to Staff Report: OTC Letter	030119T-09
10	Memo	2/22/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner RE: 2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	030119T-10
11	Draft 2019-2020 Unified Planning Work Program	January 7, 2019	Draft 2019-2020 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	030119T-11
12	Flier	N/A	Announcement of Policymaker's forum on Transportation design for community outcomes, April 22, 2019	030119T-12
13	Handout	Dec.3, 2018	Designing livable streets and trails: Healthy communities through better design	030119T-13
14	Resolution No. 19-XXXX	3/1/2019	Resolution No. 19-XXXX for the purpose of adopting the 2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Policy Statement for the Portland Metropolitan Area	030119T-14
15	Memo	2/27/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Draft 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Policy	030119T-15

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
16	Staff Report	March 1,2019	Staff Report in consideration of Resolution 19-XXXX for the purpose of adopting the 2022-24 RFFA Policy Statement for the Portland Metropolitan Area.	030119T-16
17	Policy Report	March 2019	Draft 2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) policy direction	030119T-17
18	Handout	03/01/2019	Region 1, 2021-24 STIP Development Fact Sheet, March 2019 Edition	030119T-18
19	Handout	11/13/2018	Letter from Oregon Transportation Commission RE: STIP Considerations Documentation	030119T-19
20	Handout	3/1/2019	Region 1 Leverage Opportunities: 150% Scoped Project List	030119T-20
21	Memo	2/26/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner RE: TransPort Bylaws Update	030119T-21
22	Handout	N/A	TransPort Subcommittee Bylaws, Draft to be presented to TPAC	030119T-22
23	Presentation	3/1/2019	March 2019 Formal MTIP Amendment & Approval Request of Resolution 19-49XX	030119T-23
24	Presentation	3/1/2019	DRAFT 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Policy	030119T-24
25	Presentation	3/1/2019	2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program	030119T-25