

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**
Date/time: Wednesday March 9, 2022 | 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Don Odermott
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Karen Williams
Laurie Lebowsky
Idris Ibrahim
Katherine Kelly

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley & 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
Washington State Department of Transportation
Community Representative
City of Vancouver

Alternates Attending

Jessica Berry
Erin Wardell
Dyami Valentine
Mark Lear
Dayna Webb
Julia Hajduk
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

Multnomah County
Washington County
Washington County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Sherwood and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Chris Deffebach
Lewis Lem
Rachael Tupica
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Rich Doenges

Affiliate

Washington County
Port of Portland
Federal Highway Administration
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Mike McCarthy
Steve Kelly
Jean Senechal Biggs

Affiliate

City of Tualatin
Washington County
City of Beaverton

Susie Wright
Chris Smith
Cody Field
Jessica Engelman
Lucia Ramirez
Sarah Iannarone
Erika Turney
Frank Angelo
Matt Berkow
Roxane Glynn
Sandra Hikari

Kittelson & Associates
No More Freeways
City of Tualatin
City of Beaverton
Oregon Department of Transportation
The Street Trust

Metro Staff Attending

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner	Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner	John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Tech Strategic Planner	Grace Stainback, Associate Transportation Planner
Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner	Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner
Molly Cooney-Mesker, Sr. Public Affairs Spec.	Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. Chair Kloster noted the all attendees would be listed as panelists for full viewing and participation for this workshop meeting. The link for providing 'safe space' at the meeting was shared in the chat area.

Public Communications on Agenda Items - none

Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, January 12, 2022 (Chair Kloster) For edits or corrections on the January 12, 2022 workshop the committee may send them to Marie Miller for updating. No edits/corrections were received.

2019-2021 Regional Flexible Fund – Local Agency Project Fund Exchanges Update (Grace Cho) A brief update was provided by Grace Cho on a number of Metro administered funding projects that originated in the 2019-2021 Regional Flexible Fund Program which resulted from the implementation of the 2019-2021 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation policy direction. The region agreed to allocate an estimated \$130.38 million in regional flexible funds available to support policy objectives.

In order to achieve the policy objectives, Metro and TriMet executed several different intergovernmental agreements to increase the bonding commitments and also facilitating the fund exchanging of federal dollars for local monies. As a result, Metro and TriMet completed the following:

- Add a new \$1.26 million per year bond payment through 2034 to generate \$12 million in bond proceeds to be distributed for project development activities for freight, freeway, and interchange bottlenecks (\$10 million) and active transportation (\$2 million)
- As part of the allocation of Step 2 Regional Flexible Funds, Metro worked directly with TriMet to identify the projects from the Step 2 allocation which would be eligible candidates for fund exchange TriMet general funds to exchange with Regional Flexible Funds.

As a result of implementing this approach, Metro has become the funding administrator for the bond proceeds dedicated for active transportation project development and the projects identified from

Step 2 which were funding exchanged. In total, Metro is the funding administrator for twenty (20) local transportation projects. These were described in detail in the packet memo with status of the projects and lessons learned. This agenda item will look to be rescheduled at a future TPAC workshop.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update Work Plan and Engagement Plan (Kim Ellis)

Discussion of the work plan and engagement plan for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan update was delayed for both MTAC and TPAC due to time spent discussing other regional topics at the Feb. 16 joint workshop and subsequent TPAC meeting on March 4. In lieu of an additional meeting, Metro staff request that TPAC members send feedback on the questions listed in the email that will be sent later today.

The project team will address any feedback received and continue to fine-tune the RTP update materials for consideration by TPAC and JPACT next month. On April 1, TPAC will be requested to make a recommendation to JPACT. Updated materials will be included in TPAC's April 1 packet.

Draft 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Review and Discussion (John Mermin, Metro)

An overview of the 2022-23 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was provided. Prior to the TPAC April 1 meeting where action will be requested, TPAC is being asked to look for opportunities for projects to be better coordinated, ways to add clarity to project narratives, identify any missing information in the project narratives, and identify any missing project narratives.

Comments from the committee:

- Tara O'Brien noted one of the items not discussed at the Federal Consultation meeting for the UPWP was the Federal focus on Transit Fleet Classification. TriMet will be adding additional local funds on the fleet project due to part of new funding available.
- Karen Buehrig appreciated the opportunity to participate in the Federal Consultation meeting. One suggestion provided was showing closer ties between the UPWP projects and the 2023 RTP update. It would be helpful to identify which projects with the UPWP are going to be feeding into the RTP update, as an example the Freight Mobility Project.

Another suggestion for improvement on the document was providing the total project cost listed for multiple years if the project goes beyond the one year budget reporting. It was noted some projects are currently written for more than one FY. Could there be a better way to reflect the overall cost of the project? Mr. Mermin noted the UPWP was reporting of a one-year period with the Metro FY budget summary matched with projects listed in the UPWP for that FY. However, narratives can state if projects go beyond a one-year period.

It was noted there is the transit program in the UPWP, then under this there is a description of the High Capacity Transit project that Metro will be doing. It was questioned why these were linked together. Ms. Buehrig noted the Regional Mobility Pricing Project (RMPP) was confusing with costs reported. It was suggested to be sure this is updated in regard to the costs, which seem to refer to only one quarter. It would be helpful to reflect the full costs of the project. Mr. Mermin noted we can ask ODOT to confirm the report is for the full FY.

- Glen Bolen noted that for the RMPP, the planning phase was expected to be done by next fall. There is often overlapping phases in projects and with other projects which is difficult to show in one FY. For transparency, future phases with budget reflected beyond the planning phase can be pointed out in the narratives the length of the project with possible coordination to

other projects. Ms. Buehrig noted it would help to discuss and understand the transition between the UPWP project and then the work afterwards and how TPAC interacts with this.

- Dyami Valentine noted comments provided by Chris Deffebach provided on the UPWP with clean, short descriptions and articulating what they are. If suggested edits are asked what is the timeline to provide them? It was suggested the ETC program description needs improvement as it describes what has been done, but not what is planned moving forward. The tasks listed for the SW Corridor Transit Project are OK, but the narrative needs to be tightened up with timeline better matched to the project.

Mr. Mermin thanked everyone for the comments. Further input can be provided by March 11, at which time project authors will receive this feedback and it will be placed in the draft being reviewed at the TPAC April 1 meeting.

Regional Mobility Policy Update Case Study Findings and Policy Options (Kim Ellis, Metro/ Susie Wright, Kittelson & Associates/ Glen Bolen, ODOT) Kim Ellis began the presentation by providing an overview of the status of the Regional Mobility Policy Update with future feedback and input being sought that will inform policy makers on the importance on how we measure mobility and adequacy of the transportation system for people and goods with the RTP policy goals for addressing equity, climate, safety, and congestion.

Susie Wright provided a list of draft mobility policies for the Portland region that has been developed.

1. Ensure that the public's investment in the transportation system enhances efficiency in how people and goods travel to where they need to go.
2. Provide people and businesses a variety of seamless and well-connected travel modes and services that increase connectivity, increase choices and access to low carbon transportation options so that people and businesses can conveniently and affordably reach the goods, services, places and opportunities they need to thrive.
3. Create a reliable transportation system, one that people and businesses can count on to reach destinations in a predictable and reasonable amount of time.
4. Prioritize the safety and comfort of travelers in all modes when planning and implementing mobility solutions.
5. Prioritize investments that ensure that Black, Indigenous and people of color (BIPOC) community members and people with low incomes, youth, older adults, people living with disabilities and other historically marginalized and underserved communities experience equitable mobility.

Draft recommended measures for the updated mobility policy criteria include covering all aspects of the policy elements and be specific, discrete, not overlapping, and applicable to multiple applications (e.g., different scales and time periods), and at least one "on the ground" facility-based measure.

Molly Cooney-Mesker provided a link in chat for the jamboard, where the committee could place notes with comments and/or questions during the following discussion. The draft recommended measures were described in more detail before discussion was held on each. The following was compiled from comments and questions gathered from the jamboard postings, with further comments added on the meeting recording.

Land use and transportation (VMT)

1. How will household VMT scale for jurisdictions with fewer transportation alternatives?
2. Personally, I need training on how the VMT analysis would be conducted.
3. Travel speed should not be applied to urban arterials in the region
4. Are Options 3a and 3d distinct or more "sides of the same coin"?

5. How can the VMT measure be linked explicitly to land use policies? Will the RTP policy point to land use policy direction for jurisdictions?
6. YES, include VMT/capita'
7. How could VMT/capita not be included, when our regional goals hinge on lowering VMT?
8. Could travel speed PM for arterials result in blowing out-up intersections?
9. If travel speed is used for urban arterials, target speeds for safety need to be established, and should in general not exceed 30 mph
10. VMT/capita, for sure. It seems to me it would also be important to track absolute VMT over time.
11. VMT/capita could hold steady (or decrease) but VMT in the region/jurisdiction could still be going up - which would seem to adversely affect mobility (and air quality/public health).
12. From Karen Williams, DEQ: Regarding the congestion measure, particularly travel speed on arterials - one concern I have is how positively viewing travel speed might be counter to protecting pedestrian and biker (and motorist, for that matter) safety. It may be appropriate for a congestion measure on throughways, but perhaps not on arterials, unless conveyed in the context of motor vehicle involved pedestrian/biker serious injury/fatalities.
13. Would be good to have the expert panel address the smaller scale applications and experience using VMT (e.g., in California), as well as the system scale (and maybe some of these interactions in scale)
14. Are we not recommending VMT/employee as well? Could be important from a jobs/housing balance perspective? IS this influenced by potential CFEC charge on only measuring home-based VMT?
15. What CFEC will require in terms of city/county TSPs demonstrating VMT reduction

Congestion measure/Travel Time

16. How does including travel speed as a measure impact safety outcomes?
17. How will travel speed consider the tension between speed and safety (traffic fatalities)?
18. I would support limiting congestion/speed targets to throughways, but not apply to arterials, reflective of their varying roles in the system (throughways are for cross regional trips more mobility focused vs local access to centers and corridors), where safety and options are more important
19. How will travel speed on throughways be connected to RMPP tolling assumptions and performance evaluation?
20. Would there be merit to exploring the connection to ITS as a facet of system efficiency and reliability?
21. Congestion measure should focus on and prioritize transit and investments in non-auto travel
22. Speed and time by themselves are not useful measures. Change in speed and change in time could be but it depends on the outcomes desired.
23. Free flow or congested speed?
24. I have concerns about using travel speed as a performance measure on urban arterials.
25. Focus should be on reliability (and SAFETY), not on travel speed
26. I could see congestion measure leading to more trips by auto, bigger intersections that are not safe for pedestrians, bigger roads, which are less safe
27. Yes - I support having a congestion measure
28. Yes - I support having a congestion measures for arterials
29. Yes to a congestion measure to help identify problem areas. The solutions don't have to be vehicle based.
30. For travel speed would a measure of reliability (e.g., standard deviation) be more important than absolute speed?
31. How would travel speed and travel time be calculated? Most delay occurs at the intersection level which is not captured in the regional model. For a Comp Plan Amendment (i.e. UGB expansion), what is

the size of the study area to be considered? Similar question on method of analysis for VMT/capita. What tool is to be used and over what area?

Multimodal measure

32. Yes, include pedestrian (and bicycle) crossing spacing
33. Transit system completeness needs to be included
34. System completeness is important, but completeness for transit, bicycle and walking needs to be prioritized for completion. How will the measure address this?
35. How will this scale for jurisdictions along the urban boundary versus jurisdictions in the urban core? What coordination will be done with jurisdictions just outside of the UGB?
36. Since local jurisdictions have no control over transit service, both coverage and frequency, how would this gap in system completeness inform outcomes for other modes? We can plan for transit with infrastructure, but can't 3d print buses.
37. How will this crosswalk with DLCD's work around CFEC and town centers?
38. How will these measures impact regionally significant industrial areas or employment areas where there may be a higher volume of freight activity?
39. How will this crosswalk with DLCD's work around CFEC and town centers?
40. Also on CFEC alignment, how do the inventory requirements interface with our requirements?
41. I echo the comment about the need to be able to communicate how this project and the resulting measures relate to the requirements in the upcoming changes to the TPR (CFEC).
42. Will system completeness for transit include a frequency measure?
43. For transparency, it might be helpful to include # of travel lanes in the multi modal PM
44. For transparency, it might be helpful to include # of travel lanes in the multi-modal measure
45. Support completeness - since some links are more important than others (in a center or connect more of network), how is that included?
46. A requirement to consider LTS as part of the system completeness definition could be one approach to not universally set the target but make sure we're considering this in planning and building safe, attractive non-driving options
47. I wonder how we define local connectivity...for example, look at block length or have a collector every 1/2 mile
48. How functional and design classifications interact with the system completeness requirements. Imagine this is how locals would define their desired networks, indicating various levels of importance, right?
49. For bike/ped system completeness could we evaluate 'stress level' of the facility?

Overall comments

1. How is system resiliency considered (e.g., mobility around evacuation routes, redundant routes, lifeline routes, etc.)?
2. How will these measures impact regionally significant industrial areas or employment areas where there may be a higher volume of freight activity?
3. Will ODOT continue to use other measures, like Level of Traffic Stress, for non-motorized modes?
4. While not about these measures, I just want clarity that volume to capacity (v/c) is not being considered in the set of preferred measures moving forward

The presentation ended with brief polls taken:

Do you support including a multi-modal congestion and efficiency measure in the regional mobility policy: (16 responses total)

Yes: 56%

No: 6%

Unsure: 38%

Do you support using system completeness, travel speed, and VMT capita as those measures (19 responses total)

Yes: 37%

No: 5%

Unsure: 58%

Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials – 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy brief (John Mermin and Lake McTighe, Metro) The DRAFT 2023 RTP Policy Brief for Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials was provided, which was included in the workshop packet. The purpose of the policy brief is to frame policy options for consideration by regional leaders. Policy options focus on potential strategies to address identified challenges to developing safe and healthy urban arterial roadways in the region. The brief focuses on the roadways identified as Major Arterials in the 2018 RTP, henceforth referred to as “urban arterials.”

Several reasons were provided why this strategy is needed. Urban arterials often serve as multicultural community centers dotted with vibrant businesses, affordable housing, parks and schools. In Metro’s 2040 Growth Concept, urban arterials serve as key corridors that connect regional centers. They play a critical role in the transit system and are incredibly complex. They typically have four or more travel lanes carrying tens of thousands of vehicles each day, often with posted travel speeds of 35 miles per hour or higher. Urban arterials are also major freight truck routes.

While these characteristics enable huge numbers of cars, buses and trucks to crisscross the region every day, without safety and health interventions they can be deadly, disproportionately impacting people with lower incomes and Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC). The majority of urban arterials are designated Regional Emergency Transportation Routes, serving critical life safety function during large scale disasters by helping connect our vulnerable populations with critical infrastructure and essential facilities region-wide. However, despite their critical role in the region’s transportation system, decades of underinvestment in urban arterials has led to persistent safety and equity issues. Safety, equity, economic development / land use and transit/mobility represent four important areas of intersection with urban arterials.

Land use / economic development

- Urban arterials are where people, live, work and play and are critical to implementing regional land use vision.
- Current conditions create barriers to economic development on urban arterials.

Equity

- Communities of color and with lower income disproportionately live and travel on urban arterials in Portland.
- Urban arterials contribute to unhealthy air quality in Equity Focus Areas.

Mobility (especially for Transit)

- Urban arterials provide mobility to thousands of people in Portland region on a regular basis.
- Highest bus ridership in the region is on urban arterials
- Nearly all urban arterials are frequent bus routes, but many of these routes need more frequent service and nearly all lack dedicated right of way needed for faster, more efficient service.

Safety

- A disproportionate number of serious and fatal crashes occur on urban arterials.
- A disproportionate number of serious pedestrian and bicycle crashes and fatalities occur on urban arterials.

In spite of a comprehensive policy framework supporting the development of healthy and safe roadways, transportation agencies have still not completed a network of healthy urban arterials to equitably serve people's travel needs. Understanding the challenges, as well as what has been working, will help us understand what might be done differently and identify potential strategies to achieve safe and healthy urban arterials. Challenges are not mutually exclusive.

Funding

Ongoing challenges in bringing funding to urban arterials

1. Needs are greater than available funding.
2. Lack of dedicated funding and coordinated investments.
3. Lack of identified or prioritized projects to address equity, gaps and deficiencies.

Policy / Design

Ongoing challenges to achieving multimodal designs

1. Outdated functional purpose of state-owned urban arterials.
2. Motor-vehicle throughput prioritized over other roadway functions
3. Planned land use not guiding design.
4. Gaps in data.

Recommended actions for consideration were presented. The actions would be implemented by cities, counties, TriMet, SMART, ODOT, Metro and other entities through the update and implementation of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan.

Comments from the committee:

- Consider including minor arterials in addition to major arterials, especially those in equity focus areas or along high crash corridors, as there is a lot of needs there as well.
- This is good work. Anything we can do to draw more attention to the significant need in our communities is helpful.
- Include more acknowledgement of all of the planning work that has been done on the urban arterials for years. The issue is that there isn't funding. Adjust tone and framing of brief to better reflect this, using an outcomes based approach.
- Frame up what is missing from current efforts. Is there more analysis that we need to do to get the funding that is needed and set ourselves up for success?
- Reflects shared goals of ODOT to address safety on arterials. However, would like to have a better understanding why the topic was identified as a need – where this is coming from.
- ODOT has an issue with using local standards for design on state highways. ODOT's Blueprint for Urban Design is being added into the Oregon Highway Design Manual, it has similarities with Metro's guide. ODOT engineers that stamp designs for state highways need to use state standards.
- ODOT would like to see RFFA funding continue to go towards safety. There is a clear link between the policy brief recommendations and that desire.

- One of the biggest issues is around funding. If we don't anticipate funding it constrains which projects can go into RTP. Would like to see background studies on how urban arterial issues may be limiting economic development on urban arterials, because we would like to know what we could do to support economic development. The communities along these arterials may look different depending on where they are located.
- Agree on the challenges reflected in the memo and it is good to have them all in one place going into the RTP update. There are many of us working on these actions, developing strategies and coordinating to get funding. Clarify who the actions are for, what will it inform, and the next steps for the brief from a TPAC perspective.
- Support for the intent of the policy brief. We need to build on what we have done, make us more effective, get us ready for any future regional investment measure, map out the work underway, support cross fertilization with Regional Mobility Policy.
- Jurisdictional transfer is an important part of this, but not the only outcome for how the state-owned arterials are improved; especially given the Blueprint for Urban Design we can be jointly investing in these facilities.
- Appreciating how this policy brief interacts with other levels of government, such as the FHWA report to Congress on the Complete Streets and the safe systems model. An opportunity to align regional and local efforts with the federal efforts.
- This is an important issue. Families and lives are affected by the safety issues. The data in the policy brief raises a big question on why have not been making progress on safety (we are going backwards) despite a lot of efforts to address safety. Would be helpful to better answer why this is happening.
- Looking at the RTP FC list, there are not enough urban arterial projects on it. However, the reason that the Financially Constrained RTP list does not include projects to address all the needs identified in Regional Investment measure (RIM) is funding. To improve TV Hwy as a complete street with Enhanced Transit would use up nearly all of the County's RTP budget. So much more funding and investment is needed to achieve our goals.

Staff thanked everyone for their participation with comments and input with the project. Further information will be presented as the policy brief is developed.

Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC – no comments received.

Adjournment

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, March 9, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	3/09/2022	3/09/2022 TPAC Workshop Agenda	030922T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	3/04/2022	TPAC Work Program as of 3/04/2022	030922T-02
3	Minutes	01/12/2022	Minutes for TPAC workshop, 01/12/2022	030922T-03
4	Memo	2/22/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2022-23 Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	030922T-04
5	Handout	3/2/2022	Draft FY 2022-2023 Unified Planning Work Program: I-5 Boone Bridge and Seismic Improvement Project	030922T-05
6	Memo	2/9/2022	TO: MTAC and TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, Metro/ Lidwien Rahman, ODOT RE: Case Study Analysis Findings and Discussion Draft Regional Mobility Policy Report	030922T-06
7	Attachment 1	February 2022	System Planning and Plan Amendment Case Study Analysis	030922T-07
8	Attachment A	2/7/2022	Attachment A: Supporting Materials. Memo on Case Study Analysis	030922T-08
9	Presentation	2/16/2022	Regional mobility policy update TPAC/MTAC Workshop	030922T-09
10	Handout	N/A	DRAFT 2023 RTP Policy Brief for Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials	030922T-10
11	Memo	03/09/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Status Update on the 2019-21 RFFA Fund Exchange	030922T-11
12	Presentation	03/09/22	2022-23 Unified Planning Work Program	030922T-12
13	Presentation	03/09/22	Regional mobility policy update	030922T-13
14	Handout	03/09/22	Jamboard post-its on Regional Mobility Policy Measures	030922T-14
15	Handout	03/09/22	Jamboard comments categorized on Regional Mobility Measures	030922T-15
16	Poll Results	03/09/22	Polls from TPAC March 9, 2022 workshop meeting	030922T-16
17	Presentation	03/09/22	Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials – 2023 RTP Policy Brief	030922T-17