



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, May 7, 2021 | 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon

Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair
Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Dayna Webb
Jay Higgins
Don Odermott
Jeff Owen
Chris Ford
Karen Williams
Lewis Lem
Yousif Ibrahim
Katherine Kelly

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
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
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Port of Portland
Community Representative
City of Vancouver, Washington

Alternates Attending

Jamie Stasny
Emily Miletich
Jaimie Huff
Julia Hajduk
Jon Makler
Glen Bolen
Gerik Kransky
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Sherwood and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Laurie Lebowsky
Jessica Stetson
Donovan Smith
Gladys Alvarado
Idris Ibrahim
Wilson Munoz
Rachael Tupica
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Rich Doenges

Affiliate

Washington State Department of Transportation
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Federal Highway Administration
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Mike Foley
Jean Senechal Biggs
Kari Schlosshauer
Sarah Iannore
Brett Morgan
Judith Gray
Kara Hall
Kate Freitag
Laura Edmonds

Affiliate

City of Beaverton
Safe Routes to Schools
The Street Trust
1000 Friends of Oregon
Fehrs & Peers
Fehrs & Peers
Oregon Department of Transportation
North Clackamas Chamber of Commerce

Metro Staff Attending

Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead	Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Cindy Pederson, Research Center Manager	Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner	Eliot Rose, Senior Tech & Transportation Planner
Matthew Hampton, Sr. Transportation Planner	Patrick McLaughlin, TOD Development Planner
Robert Spurlock, Senior Regional Planner	Noel Mickelberry, Associate Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner	Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

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

Vice Chairman Leybold called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Guests, public and staff were noted as attending. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Committee input form on creating a Safe Space at TPAC** (Vice Chairman Leybold) The link to adding comments and input for creating a safe space at TPAC was noted in the chat area of the meeting, which members are welcome to use at any time during the meeting. Comments will be collected and shared at the end of the meeting.
- **Updates from committee members and around the Region** (Vice Chairman Leybold and all) Updates to the TPAC member/alternate member roster were noted. Allison Boyd is now the member representative from Multnomah County; Jessica Berry and Emily Miletich are alternative members. Jay Higgins is now the member representative from City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County. Chris Strong is the alternative member. These updates will be made in TPAC rosters and meeting/notices distribution.
- Jeff Owen noted TriMet's hiring process for a new General Manager is moving along well. New leadership identification in this role is expected soon.
- Eric Hesse noted that Metro Councilor Bob Stacey was recently honored for his long term service to the region with the renaming of the over cross in SE Portland.
- **Monthly Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) It was noted that in the meeting packet the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendment and administrative modification project lists during April 2021 timeframe were reported. For any questions on the memo contact Mr. Lobeck.

- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) Ms. McTighe provided an update on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties over the previous month and the total for the year. There have been a high number of pedestrians killed this year in addition to motorcycle crashes, many due to speed factors. Portland is on track to 85% higher crashes this year over last. A reminder was given on the upcoming Regional Transportation Safety Forum May 26, 9-12 noon. Vice Chair Leybold noted a recent article in the Atlantic Magazine on the serious impact to lives with fatal crashes. The article link: <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/05/car-accident/618766/>
- **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) proposed subcommittee/work group/pilot concept** (Vice Chairman Leybold) Vice Chair Leybold noted the cover memo and proposals for increased engagement on MTIP activities with options of either a subcommittee or work group. The two options were described in the memo. TPAC was asked to provide feedback in the next week directly to Vice Chair Leybold and answer the questions in the cover memo with any suggestions and input. The feedback provided will be brought forward next month. Metro staff is targeting July for an initial kickoff meeting for initiating this work.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items (none)

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from April 2, 2021

MOTION: To approve minutes from April 2, 2021 as written.

Moved: Don Odermott

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

5. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 21-5177

(Ken Lobeck) The MTIP Formal Amendment 21-5177 was presented. The May 2021 MTIP Formal Amendment bundle consists of required updates and changes to two groups of projects. The first group involves reprogramming several UPWP project grouping buckets out to FY 2025. The UPWP projects are being pushed-out to the MTIP non-constrained year in FY 2025 to avoid possible conflicts with the annual Obligation Targets. The key conflict involves how much Metro allocated Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds will be needed to support the annual UPWP.

Once the annual UPWP is developed with the approved list of project, the STBG funds will be advanced through a formal/full amendment to the required obligation year in the MTIP. This action will help avoid identifying UPWP projects prematurely for the annual Obligation Targets program that end not being part of the final UPWP or, due to a need to further scope the project, will not obligate in the current federal fiscal year.

The UPWP reprogramming action occurring through this formal/full MTIP will take two formal amendments to complete. Thirteen projects are identified as part of the May 2021 Formal MTIP. The remaining UPWP reprogramming actions will be completed through the June 2021 MTIP Formal Amendment. The second group of projects included in the May 21 Formal MTIP Amendment consist of the regular projects that require changes which are significant to trigger the formal amendment.

Following descriptions of the projects, Mr. Lobeck asked for questions on any of the materials before asking for a recommendation on the resolution.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked why Metro funds are being bumped out to FY 23-25. Mr. Lobeck noted that the annual Obligation Targets program is designed on the capital project delivery process which includes multiple project phases, defined scopes, and defined approval steps. This allows the project managers, ODOT Local Agency Liaisons (LAL), and Metro oversight staff the ability to project phase obligation timing and delivery of scope activities six months or more with an 80% or higher confidence level. This is not the case for UPWP planning projects that utilize federal funds.

UPWP planning projects are less structured in scope and delivery requirements. They do not fit well into the capital project highway delivery process. Due to these differences, UPWP planning projects are more difficult to estimate their obligation month with 90% or higher certainty factor. As a result, estimating the correct obligation timing for UPWP planning projects is about 50%-50% guess. Unfortunately, with a minimum obligation target of 80%, there is an insufficient error margin for the Metro Annual Obligation Targets project list to absorb the failure of UPWP planning projects to obligate during their identified fiscal year and still meet the 80% minimum obligation requirement.

Vice Chair Leybold noted that Metro would refine this message for JPACT for clarity.

- Don Odermott asked if the removal of the Stark Street project and award to the Cornelius Pass Road project was a step 2 RFFA project. Vice Chair Leybold noted this was an ODOT allocation project of enhanced funds.
- Chris Ford added noted that in March the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) awarded \$60 million to the Office of Mobility for work on the tolling project. Significant interest on the project resulted in \$1 million of this funding to be used for early communication and public involvement. ODOT is working with Metro staff on clarification with project changes as needed.
- Karen Buehrig asked for more clarity on the process and selection by ODOT on the Cornelius Pass Road project when presenting this to JPACT. It should be noted this was not a RFFA decision but an OTC decision, and why this selection was made for the funds. It was noted that as scoping progressed with the Stark Street project, a significant increased project cost would impact the project if it moved forward. ODOT and Multnomah County agreed that the funds could be re-purposed and applied to a substitute project. It was agreed that more clarity be presented to JPACT on the source of the funds and why used for the Cornelius Pass Road project.

MOTION: TPAC recommends to JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 21-5177 consisting of thirteen projects which include required updates to the UPWP impacting Metro, and two additional projects impacting Multnomah County and ODOT.

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

6. **2025-27 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Strategic Direction preparation for recommendation in June meeting** (Dan Kaempff) Mr. Kaempff provided a review of input from three RFFA workshops and questions to discuss development of the 2025-2027 Program Direction. The RFFA Program Direction is a document with a statement of intent to target regional funds to achieve regional priorities, set objectives and outcomes for allocation process, and define funding categories (Steps 1 & 2).

A series of questions were proposed by Mr. Kaempff for TPAC discussion.

Q1: Step 2 categories & targets

Is TPAC supportive of eliminating the Step 2 categories & targets?

- Active Transportation/Complete Streets – 75%
- Freight Mobility – 25%

Input received throughout the workshop process indicated support to eliminate the Step 2 categories of Active Transportation/Complete Streets and Freight/Economic Development and their associated funding targets in favor of a process that allows projects to be proposed of any mix of mode and function improvements that best advance the Investment Priority categories. Metro staff intends to present a Program Direction recommendation to TPAC that is responsive to this input. This may require additional emphasis of evaluating projects or ensuring there is an adequate pool of projects that will be eligible to utilize the different sources of federal funding allocated to projects in the RFFA/MTIP process.

Q2: Should any priorities be weighted?

Comments made in the first two workshops indicated that some participants had an interest in emphasizing certain priorities. In response to that interest, the first question posed in the third workshop was to get a more definitive sense of people’s opinions on weighting of investment priority categories. Based on input from the workshop attendees, it does not appear that there is a strong interest to weight any of the four RTP priorities.

In response, staff is not recommending any weighting occur in the Step 2 project technical evaluation. The technical evaluation report will be structured in a manner that provides information to TPAC and JPACT that allows them to consider selecting a set of projects that focus on one or more of the RTP priorities, should they choose to do so.

Q3: Consider other evaluation areas?

- Should there be an additional priority area beyond the four RTP priorities?
 - If so, is one of two identified options preferred?
 - Include In The Four or Four Plus One?

Workshop participants indicated an interest in measuring the anticipated economic outcomes of proposed projects. There are two approaches that staff has identified that could be followed to evaluate projects in this manner.

1. **Include in The Four:** Include outcomes and measures within the four RTP priorities for recognizing how they are advancing economic outcomes, as defined by the RTP Goal 2, its related objectives, and the Investment Priorities defined in RTP Chapter 6. This approach recognizes the inclusion of economic considerations in the investment priorities used in developing the 2018 RTP project lists. Outcomes and measures would reflect the identified policy language related to attracting jobs and businesses, and saving time and money. A project’s technical evaluation would reflect that economic outcomes were

considered as part of the overall evaluation. Economic considerations would not receive a separate rating along with ratings in the four priority areas.

2. Four Plus One: Develop an additional category in addition to the four RTP priorities to enable measurement of how a project is advancing economic outcomes as identified in the 2018 RTP.⁵ In addition to the above economic aims, maintaining reasonably good transportation access is identified as being an important part of keeping and growing traded sector industries. Traded sector industries have been identified in the RTP as the primary enabler of economic growth in the region.

Q4: Input on Outcomes-based approach

Based on the input related to elimination of the existing Step 2 categories, for workshop 3, staff asked for input on a draft Step 2 single project category evaluation approach. This approach is aimed at identifying quantifiable project outcomes, tied to the four RTP priorities. This approach reflects participant and stakeholder feedback following the previous RFFA cycle indicating the need for a more clear connection between RTP priorities and the project evaluation methodology. The intent with this approach is to provide more clarity to how projects will be evaluated and assist local jurisdictions in advancing projects for consideration that most completely meet RTP investment priorities.

If this approach is used, further work would follow the adoption of the 2025-2027 RFFA Program Direction to identify specific measures for each outcome. The goal is to create a transparent project application and evaluation process that is clear to proposers and provides decision-makers with a thorough understanding of how proposed projects advance the RTP Investment Priorities.

During the summer of 2021, Metro will convene a project evaluation work group comprising a representative cross section of regional agency staff and community leaders. This work group will assist in the creation of these measures and evaluation tools and conduct the evaluation in spring 2022. Staff will present the evaluation methodology and framework to TPAC for their input prior to the opening of the project call in November 2021.

Q5: Enhanced Transit Corridors

Workshop participants were asked for their input on how the region should consider a request from TriMet for another round of regional funds to advance the Enhanced Transit Corridors concept. Staff has identified two possible approaches to the TriMet request.

1. Metro staff would work with TriMet to develop an application for a one-time, programmatic allocation of funds. The application would include information on specific locations identified for improvements, define how TriMet and local jurisdictions would coordinate on project delivery, etc.
2. TriMet would work with local jurisdictions on one or more Step 2 applications for specific projects.

Mr. Kaempff reminded TPAC of next steps in the process. Staff will present a draft 2025-2027 RFFA Program Direction to TPAC for their discussion and recommendation to JPACT at the June 4 TPAC meeting. JPACT will consider and take action on a TPAC recommendation at their July 15 meeting.

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse asked about the weighing of priorities, measures and scoring with economic development. How is the relationship of categories vs outcomes tied together, or should these

be separate criteria for scoring projects? Mr. Kaempff noted the intent to have decision makers see how economic development can be shown in criteria with outcomes in projects. Questions in the applications will address considerations with economic development.

A question was asked on the engagement process with the working group in developing the RFFA work program. Mr. Kaempff noted that once the program direction is established staff will work on the methodology which will be brought to TPAC. It was noted that the Enhanced Transit Corridors concept was not a Step 1 investment, but a one-time program request.

- Karen Williams noted initial discomfort with eliminating Step 2 category targets. Where would incentives to more active transportation projects move to? What are some options for retaining other transportation incentives besides vehicles? Mr. Kaempff noted that in contrast to the last RFFA cycle, this cycle looks to provide opportunities in projects with more creative, broader funding categories that still reflect RTP priorities, but do not reduce active transportation while achieving more multiple outcomes.
- Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on the process with TPAC's recommendation to JPACT on this program direction. Mr. Kaempff noted that staff is sharing input from TPAC to JPACT from today's meeting. TPAC will make final recommendation to JPACT in June, which JPACT will take action on in July.
- After reading Question one, it was noted the challenge of deciding to eliminate the funding split that may affect future decisions in the criteria and outcomes discussion.
- Jeff Owen noted that by removing the split, active transportation may benefit by being blended with other categories.
- Don Odermott noted there was support to remove the silo (split funding) as it made the peanut butter spread too thin for investment purposes, but to also establish an improved scoring structure on projects. There should be an awareness of how we design scores for evaluation, perhaps test projects through this scoring process.
- Chris Deffebach noted the 75%/25% split model is outdated.
- Karen Williams noted when the final recommendation is brought to TPAC it would be good to have the explanation of why the split was outdated and not achieving goals, and new methods recommended without the split with examples of how goals might be achieved.
- Karen Buehrig noted she was supportive of considering economic development in evaluation of projects. However, it was challenging on how and where these evaluation were being reviewed. It was suggested that establishing the economic development impact be assessed in a consistent manner. It was noted the 4 + 1 approach be understood that allowed for not overweighing scores for importance between RTP priorities.
- Eric Hesse noted that with economic development a key issue on direction it was important to get guidance on scoring this factor. Currently, he was disinclined to see the funds in separate categories, partly with multiple advancements of projects as the goal in outcome based, but if moving away from the split and back to scoring criteria that would achieve multiple outcomes. It was noted that if adding another category (economic development) in scoring projects, how this could be achieved mixed with other integrated project uses and outcomes.
- Jon Makler agreed with Mr. Hesse and Mr. Odermott's comments. It was noted he was in the thick chunky peanut butter camp on the danger of spreading the funds too thin. Safety is important but should not outweigh other categories with the scoring factors.
- Lewis Lem agreed with Mr. Makler and Mr. Hesse. It was noted that economics cut across costs and benefits in projects along with equity; all should be under consideration.

- Chris Deffebach was in favor of including economic development in the outcomes with more discussion and development on how this would fit in with criteria.
- Don Odermott was in favor of the 4 + 1 option that would add economic development as a category, which could open access to industrial significant areas that currently have no roads and hard to score projects.
- Jay Higgins recommended that jurisdictions bring forward ETC projects to Step 2.
- Karen Buehrig supports the ETC in Step 2. Metro already has ETC projects in the investment areas program so this would seem to fit with Step 2. Regarding the committee brought together for evaluation and developing criteria, there should be separation between creating measures and selecting/evaluating the projects.
- Eric Hesse noted that with ETC projects it was suggested to explore models with these projects.
- Don Odermott noted that in the County Coordinating Committee they were leaning toward ETC in Step 2.

7. 2021 Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Strategy Update (Caleb Winter, Metro/Kara Hall, Fehr & Peers) Mr. Winter and Ms. Hall provided an update at the mid-point of the 2021 TSMO Strategy Update. Metro, Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and their partner agencies are collaborating to develop the 2021 TSMO Strategy. The 2021 TSMO Strategy will position the region to collaboratively manage the transportation system in a rapidly changing environment while achieving regional goals such as safety, equity, vibrant communities, shared prosperity, and a healthy environment.

The first task of the TSMO Strategy was to bring an equity focus to the update. Metro DEI staff, Fehr & Peers consultants and leaders of Community Based Organizations helped develop a racial equity assessment tool for TSMO called the Equity Decision Tree. Starting at the roots, the assessment begins with seeking an understanding of the context, choices and voices that define a problem experienced on the transportation system. A series of connecting branches asks specific questions to arrive at an equity-focused solution, and then evaluate and be accountable to the result. The equity focus informed the region's TSMO vision and goals. The vision is an aspirational statement of what is achievable, and six goals provide strategic direction.

TSMO's vision statement: Collaborate to provide reliable, agile, and connected travel choices so that all users are free from harm, and to eliminate the disparities experienced by people of color and historically marginalized communities.

Goals:

Free From Harm

Create a transportation system where all users are free from harm.

Regional Partnerships/Collaboration

Collaborate as effective stewards of the transportation system.

Eliminate Disparities

Eliminate the disparities in the transportation system experienced by people of color and historically marginalized communities.

Connected Travel Choices

Connect all people to the goods, services, and destinations they need through a variety of travel choices.

Reliable Travel Choices

Provide a transportation system that is reliable for all users.

Prepare for Change

Manage the system to be agile in the face of growth, disruptions, and changing technology.

Next steps in the process is developing the objectives, targets and performance measures for each goal. Second half of the Strategy Update will focus on defining how far we can go in 10 years. Upcoming presentations and opportunities for adding input on the goal development toward strategy and action was described. TPAC will be reviewing this for adoption in late summer or early fall. The committee is encouraged to contact Mr. Winter with input.

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse noted the work on the development with the goals and strategies and how technology outcomes can help with our projects. It was noted this could advance our work on the Mobility Policy Update as one example. Caution was given with the dozens of performance measures voiced, since more data can be less information.
- Jeff Owen appreciated the work on this. More time will be spent looking at the documents.
- Karen Buehrig asked what was meant my Regional Leadership Forum. This was clarified as the Community Leaders Forum on May 14 that plans to discuss various transportation projects.
- Sarah Iannarone noted that meaningful community engagement - especially among trauma impacted and communities of color - around setting targets and measures across the objectives (not just equity objectives) feels important in this moment of reckoning around racial justice and also to build important future relationships with communities who need these investments most.

- 8. Metro Emerging Trends Study (Eliot Rose)** Mr. Rose presented information on the Metro Emerging Trends study that will outline how Metro and our partners should respond to the major transportation trends that we expect to face in the Portland region during the coming decade following the COVID-19 pandemic and other recent disruptions. Metro is carrying out the study over the next year so that it can inform the 2023 RTP update.

Several data charts were shown to show trends collected so far. Asked if health concerns would change drive modes, active transportation and driving appear likely to be popular post-pandemic – other modes (carpool, ride share and public transit), not so much. The chart showing trip volumes and how we might close the transit gap showed that compared to vehicle trips, transit ridership declined more sharply and recovered more slowly during the pandemic. Climate events are also impacting how people travel.

When surveyed how concerns about racism and personal safety affect travel, walking while black vs city wide showed increased percentages walking while black. Increased concerns about racism and personal safety, as well as fear of exposure to COVID and other diseases, could have a long-term impact on people's choices.

Is this the teleworking revolution? Teleworking appears to be here to stay, but we don't know to what extent. Higher-income workers are much more likely to be able to work from home. Peak travel times may have changed. It was noted that early data suggest that teleworkers replace peak commutes with non-work trips during the day.

The freight study will add input to e-commerce trends as well. E-commerce appears to be here to stay. Question to be answered are how much did the pandemic accelerate its growth? How will that growth impact our streets and our communities? It was noted that trips to the places that anchor regional centers – stores, offices, and transit stations – fell sharply during the pandemic.

The project timeline was shared. May – June 2021 a consultant will be selected. The study is expected to take one year. From July – December 2022 study findings will inform RTP policy development and investment strategy. TPAC is encouraged to contact Mr. Rose on the scope of project and project relevant they are working on as well. TPAC will have updates on the study further in the year.

9. Regional Freight Study Updates (Tim Collins) This agenda item will be presented at a later date.

10. 2024-27 ODOT Administered Funding – Program Allocations and Scoping Updates (Chris Ford/Jon Makler, ODOT) Jon Makler presented an overview of statewide funding programs and an update on scoping of projects in Region 1. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) adopted “programmatic allocations” for the 2024-27 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in January 2021. These funds are for Federal Fiscal Years ‘25, ‘26 and ‘27 which begin October 1 the year before.

Various pie charts were shown. The 24-27 STIP: “Other” Programs include State and Planning Research, and Indirect Cost Allocation Plan Highway Planning, \$161 billion over 3 years. Local programs, \$405 billion over 3 years includes Surface Transportation Programs to large MPOs, CMPQ, and Cities/Counties STIP funding. Public & Active Transportation allocates \$225 billion over 3 years, the Safety program \$147 billion, ADA & Enhance program, \$175 billion; \$263 billion, respectively. Fix-it program, which includes HB17 funds, allocates \$827 billion over 3 years.

Mr. Makler noted future TPAC presentations will dig into the individual programs and that ODOT is planning a workshop for the Region 1 Area Commission on Transportation this summer. TPAC will be notified when scheduled.

Regarding status of Region 1 scoping:

- Managers of programs (“Bridge”) produce lists for scoping.
- Technical teams investigate (“scope”) batches of projects on a rolling basis.
- In Region 1, the first batch kicked off this week.
- The process will stretch through the remainder of 2021.
- ODOT will share scoping lists once program managers approve their release.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig asked if the scoping projects were mostly for the Fix-It program or more broad programs being submitted. Mr. Makler noted that from the list he has seen so far these are the Fix-It projects. The State ARTS projects ODOT knew early and ODOT would be scoping. Local ARTS projects are still being developed as more becomes known with cost effectiveness evaluation. The bike/ped strategy program will also take time to learn more before scoping can be developed.
- Chris Deffebach who was developing the guidelines for program evaluations? Mr. Makler noted the Active Transportation program came under the direction of Karyn Criswell. It was not known if their advisory committee and/or staff would be working on the guidelines.

11. Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC (Vice Chairman Leybold) Vice Chair Leybold noted the comments in shared anonymously for making TPAC a more safe space. For ways to elevate our community member connections in the meeting, it was suggested showing only TPAC members as panelists and showing guests and staff as attendees. It was asked if appropriate to reach out to members for specific RFFA feedback on program proposals before the next meeting. These ideas and input from TPAC will be reviewed and forwarded to staff.

12. Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Vice Chairman Leybold at 12:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, May 7, 2021

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	5/7/2021	5/7/2021 TPAC Agenda	050721T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	4/29/2021	TPAC Work Program as of 4/29/2021	050721T-02
3	Memo	4/28/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments	050721T-03
4	Memo	4/29/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: Monthly fatal crash update	050721T-04
5	Memo	04/30/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ted Leybold, Metro RE: MTIP topics at TPAC	050721T-05
6	Draft Minutes	04/02/2021	Draft TPAC minutes from April 2, 2021	050721T-06
7	Resolution 21-5177	05/07/2021	Resolution 21-5177 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2021-24 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO REPROGRAM UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) ANNUAL PROGRAM ESTIMATES OUTSIDE THE CONSTRAINED MTIP TO AVOID OBLIGATION TARGET CONFLICTS IMPACTING METRO, PLUS ADD ONE AND CANCEL ONE PROJECT IMPACTING MULTNOMAH COUNTY AND ODOT (MA21-10-MAY)	050721T-07
8	Exhibit A to Resolution 21-5177	05/07/2021	Exhibit A to Resolution 21-5177 2021-2024 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program	050721T-08
9	Staff Report	04/27/2021	Staff Report to Resolution 21-5177	050721T-09
10	Memo	04/30/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Input on DRAFT 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Program Direction	050721T-10
11	Report	April 2021	2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Step 1 Investments Report	050721T-011
12	Memo	04/29/2021	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Caleb Winter, Metro and Scott Turnoy, ODOT RE: Vision and Goals for the 2021 Transportation System Management & Operations Strategy Update	050721T-12

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
13	Handout	N/A	Equity Decision Tree	050721T-13
14	Slide	05/07/2021	March 2021 traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties*	050721T-14
15	Presentation	05/07/2021	2021-24 MTIP May 2021 Formal Amendment Summary Resolution 21-5177	050721T-15
16	Presentation	05/07/2021	2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Program Direction	050721T-16
17	Presentation	05/07/2021	2021 Transportation System Management and Operations Strategy Update	050721T-17
18	Presentation	05/07/2021	Emerging trends study	050721T-18
19	Presentation	05/07/2021	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program	050721T-19