

# Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**  
Date/time: Friday, June 3, 2022 | 9:00 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  
Chris Deffebach  
Lynda David  
Eric Hesse  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Jay Higgins  
Don Odermott  
Tara O'Brien  
Chris Ford  
Laurie Lebowsky  
Lewis Lem  
Idris Ibrahim  
Rachael Tupica  
Katherine Kelly

**Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Portland  
City of Happy Valley 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  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Port of Portland  
Community Representative  
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)  
City of Vancouver, WA

**Alternates Attending**

Jamie Stasny  
Dayna Webb  
Glen Bolen  
Gerik Kransky

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

**Members Excused**

Karen Williams  
Rob Klug  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Jeremy Borrego  
Rich Doenges

**Affiliate**

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

**Guests Attending**

Brad Choi  
Camilla Dartnell  
Chris Smith  
Cindy Dauer  
Cody Field

**Affiliate**

City of Hillsboro  
Kittelsohn & Associates  
No More Freeways  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
City of Tualatin

**Guests attending, (continued)**

Garet Prior	Oregon Department of Transportation
Jamie Snook	TriMet
Jean Senechal-Biggs	City of Beaverton
Jessica Engelmann	City of Beaverton
Jim Howell	
John Charles	Cascade Policy Institute
Mara Krinke	IBR Team
Michael Foley	
Mike McCarthy	City of Tualatin
Ryan LeProwse	IBR Team
Ryan Packer	
Shilpa Mallem	IBR Team
Steve Koper	City of Tualatin
Andre Lightsey-Walker	The Street Trust
Vanessa Vissar	Oregon Department of Transportation
Will Farley	City of Lake Oswego
William Burgel	

**Metro Staff Attending**

Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager	John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner	Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner
Ken Lobeck, Senior Transportation Planner	Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Transportation Tech & Analyst	Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner
Connor Ayers, Metro Councilor Advisor	Cindy Pederson, Research Center Manager
Margi Bradway, Dept. Director Planning	Malu Wilkinson, Investment Areas Manager
Andrea Pastor, Senior Regional Planner	Noel Mickelberry, Associate Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner	Chris Johnson, Research Center Manager
Clint Chiavarini, Senior GIS Specialist	Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara, Investment Areas Mgr.
Kate Hawkins, Senior Transportation Planner	Matt Bihn, Principal Transportation Planner
Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner	Ramona Perrault, Council Policy Advisor
Robert Spurlock, Senior Transportation Planner	Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

**Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions**

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Committee members, member alternates, guests, public and staff were noted as attending. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. It was noted future hybrid committee meetings were being planned but would stay virtual until further notice. Changes to TPAC community member appointments and structure was being proposed to Metro Council with a report on this provided soon. Closed caption at committee meetings will begin immediately. Input was encouraged for providing safe space for everyone at the meeting via the link in chat. Comments would be shared at the end of the meeting.

**Comments from the Chair and Committee Members**

- **Updates from committee members and around the Region**  
Don Odermott announced that Julia Hajduk, alternate member representing Cities of Washington County on TPAC, has accepted the position of City Manager of Stayton. A new member alternate will be named by the Mayors of Washington County soon.

Lewis Lem shared a newsroom link in chat regarding the Port of Portland grant award which is part of efforts to improve cargo flow and increase capacity at Terminal 6:

<https://www.portofportland.com/Newsroom/Connect-Oregon-Grant-Greenlights-Increased-Capacity-at-Terminal-6>

Rachael Tupica announced she has accepted a new position within the Federal Highway Administration in a different division in Michigan. Jasmine Harris will be named member representative for FHWA starting next week, with alternate member to be named soon.

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Chair Kloster referred to the memo in the packet provided by Ken Lobeck on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during June 2022. For any questions on the monthly MTIP amendment projects you may contact Mr. Lobeck directly.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The fatal crashes for May 22 reported 52 fatalities since the beginning of the year. Full information from the memo was added to the packet following the meeting. It was announced a new USDOT grant program for Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A). <https://www.transportation.gov/grants/SS4A> Metro will be applying for a grant, and offers to help cities and counties with assistance wanting to apply as well.

Chris Ford announced that thanks to help from the legislature, City of Portland and ODOT staff funds received for the jurisdictional transfer project on 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue will begin delivery of safety projects on this arterial. In addition to agency partners, community partner contributions was also credited. Eric Hesse added the link to the PBOT webpage on the corridor:

<https://www.portland.gov/transportation/planning/82nd-avenue>

In response to a question of location and date of a motorcyclist fatality in May, Ms. McTighe noted information from ODOT data has a delayed time for confirmation, but Katherine Kelly's mention of Powell Blvd. and SE 62<sup>nd</sup> Avenue on May 14 will be included in the totals.

- **Climate Expert Panel Announcement, June 22, 7:30-10am, Zoom** (Kim Ellis) Details on the upcoming Climate Expert Panel meeting were shared. Metro has convened a panel of experts to provide insights from around the country. Pre-registration is required. An agenda and materials will be sent in advance. The webinar will include a moderated discussion followed by an opportunity for Metro Council and JPACT members to ask questions of the panelists. Other interested parties and regional partners are invited to listen in. Questions for the panel can be submitted in advance so they can be integrated into the discussion.
- **2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list review – reminder due June 10** (Kim Ellis) Referring to the packet memo, Metro is requesting transportation agency staff to review the full 2018 RTP project list to:
  - (1) identify projects that have been completed since 2018 and
  - (2) identify projects that have local, regional, state or federal funding committed to them.This information is due June 10.
- **2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) network maps review – reminder due June 10** (Kim Ellis) Referring to the packet memo, Metro is requesting local jurisdictions (that have completed plans since adoption of the 2018 RTP) to review and identify proposed changes to

the RTP Network maps. Proposed changes should be based on adopted local Transportation System Plans, Comprehensive plans, Corridor or Area plans, and consistent with RTP network classifications. Proposed edits to staff are due June 10.

- **Modeling 101 Session reminder** (Kim Ellis)  
It was announced a webinar on Metro modeling tools would take place June 6, 1-3 p.m. Pre-registration is required. The registration link was shared:  
[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_WldhdHxArt26NNARoJwOxA](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_WldhdHxArt26NNARoJwOxA)  
A link to the agenda was shared. A video of webinar and factsheets about Metro's tools will be posted on Metro's website late next week for those who cannot attend.
- **JPACT/RTP Metro Council workshop announcement** (submitted by Jaye Cromwell)  
Metro staff have been working hard to plan our 2023 Regional Transportation Plan update JPACT/ Council workshop series, which will take place monthly from June-October. These joint workshops of the Metro Council and JPACT are an opportunity for Metro Council and JPACT members to have space to discuss critical elements of the 2023 RTP update.

The first workshop will take place on Thursday, June 30<sup>th</sup> from 7:30am-9:30am. The workshop topic will be on process, vision, goals, and objectives of the 2023 RTP update. Staff are planning for the workshop to be in-person at Conservation Hall in the Oregon Zoo. There will be a livestream of the event for folks to watch from home, but due to the nature of the participation required, we are not offering the option to participate remotely.

#### **Public Communications on Agenda Items**

##### **Chris Smith, Just Crossing Alliance**

Mr. Smith presented information on the alliance, a group of 25 climate, environmental and equity groups that are looking for the most sustainable, equitable outcome on the Interstate Bridge Replacement project. They are concerned about the design of the bridge regarding fiscal responsibility with current no-phasing of the project, with the full cost competing with other transportation projects at the same time. They are asking Metro and other endorsement agencies to include a phase able alternative in the NEPA process.

#### **Consideration of TPAC Minutes from May 6, 2022**

##### **MOTION: To approve minutes from May 6, 2022.**

Moved: Laurie Lewbowski

Seconded: Jay Higgins

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.**

#### **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 22-5271** (Ken

Lobeck, Metro) Mr. Lobeck presented information on MTIP Amendment 22-5271 consisting of two projects:

##### **Project #1 - Key 22603: I-405 Fremont Bridge (Willamette River) West Ramps**

This is new project being added to the MTIP. Funding supporting the Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Right-of-Way (ROW) phases are being added now through this amendment. PE totals \$11,632,000 while ROW totals \$127,000 for a programming total of \$11,759,000. PE is schedule to start during FFY 2023 with ROW commencing in FFY 2024. The construction phase is planned to start in FFY 2025. The construction phase will be added to the 2024-27 STIP and 2024-29 MTIP Updates. The preliminary construction phase estimate is \$103,730,000. The total project cost estimate currently is \$115,489,000.

**Project #2 - Key 22431: OR141/OR217 Curb Ramps**

From the Change Management Request (CMR): Updated PE estimate to perform the proposed work exceeds the current PE budget in the STIP. The additional ROW is adjusted based on the statewide module. When originally programmed cost estimates were optimistic and had anticipated cost reductions due to maturation of the ADA program, as seen in other DOT programs. However, due to current market conditions and skilled labor shortages these anticipated cost reductions have not come to pass. The cost estimates are therefore being reset. \$1,425,674 is being added to the PE phase with \$499,965 added to the ROW phase. This increases the total project cost from \$2,736,658 to \$4,662,297. The ROW phase requires more time than was allowed and this impacts the CN phase. Construction is being slipped as a result.

**MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 22-5271 consisting of a new ODOT project and a cost increase adjustment.**

Moved: Chris Deffebach

Seconded: Don Odermott

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.**

**Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 22-5272** (Ken Lobeck, Metro) Mr. Lobeck presented information on MTIP Amendment 22-5272 consisting of three projects:

**Project #1. Key – New TBD: Willamette Shore Line Rail & Trestle Repair-Phase I (TriMet)**

The project is TriMet’s Willamette Shore Line Rail & Trestle Repair-Phase I project. The \$2 million congressional earmark award is for funding to repair the existing trestles, conduct routine maintenance, upgrade the Nebraska rail crossing, conduct geotech exploration and miscellaneous trestle and track improvements for increase public safety. Total project cost estimate is \$2.4 million with final MTIP programming that may evolve over time.

**Project #2. Key – 22432: US30BY Curb Ramps**

Project Description: At various location on US30 Bypass in the NE Portland area, construct ADA compliant curbs and ramps. The project requires additional funds to address phase funding shortages impact PE and ROW. The formal amendment adds new IJA funds to the PE and ROW phases to address phase funding shortfalls. \$8,333,069 is added to the project increasing the project cost from \$17,223,368 to \$25,556,437. The cost increase represents a 48.4% increase to the project.

**Project #3 - Key – 20472: OR99E: Clackamas River (McLoughlin) Bridge**

Project Description: Design for a future project to repaint the bridge. The paint is required to protect this steel structure from corrosion. The project requires additional funds to address phase funding shortages impacting the PE phase. Funding supporting the ROW phase also is being added. The formal amendment adds \$947,000 to PE and \$52,000 for ROW phase activities. The Phase increases from \$250,000 to \$1,197,000. With the ROW phase funding, the total project cost increases from \$250,000 to \$1,249,000.

**MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 22-5272 consisting of TriMet’s new Willamette Shoreline Rail Repair project and two ODOT project cost increase adjustments.**

Moved: Tara O’Brien

Seconded: Chris Deffebach

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.**

**Interstate 5 Bridge Replacement Modified LPA Resolution 22-5273** (Matt Bihn, Metro, Mara Krinke, IBR Team, Shilpa Mallem, IBR Team, Ryan LeProwse, IBR Team) Mr. Bihn began the presentation by

sharing the program timeline and IBR Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) Process. From now to mid-2024, additional analysis and design refinements that result in a *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)* are planned. In mid-2024 additional design details will be finalized plus off-site improvements and mitigations. Construction is planned to begin in 2025.

The IBR modified LPA was developed with input of project staff groups informed by public engagement and feedback from community groups, with eight partners asked to present to their boards or commissions. A tentative schedule of these presentation meetings was shown.

The IBR Program recommends the following components for the Modified LPA (read as Exhibit A later in the meeting):

1. A replacement of the current I-5 Bridge with a seismically sound bridge.
2. A commitment to increase and implement attractive transit options across the Columbia River by supporting a variety of transit services that meet the needs of customers traveling between varied markets through:
  - Continuation of C-TRAN express bus service from markets north of the Bridge Influence Area (BIA) to the downtown Portland area utilizing new bus on shoulder facilities, where available, within the BIA.
  - Continuation of C-TRAN's current and future Bus Rapid Transit lines as described in adopted regional plans and known as the Vine.
  - New Light Rail Transit (LRT) service as the preferred mode for the dedicated High-Capacity Transit improvement within the BIA.
  - An alignment of LRT that begins with a connection at the existing Expo Center LRT station in Portland, OR, extends north, with a new station at Hayden Island, continues across the Columbia River on a new I-5 bridge, and generally follows I-5 with an interim Minimum Operable Segment not extending north of E. Evergreen Boulevard, in Vancouver, WA. There will be multiple stations in the City of Vancouver to be decided by the Vancouver City Council in consultation with C-TRAN, the Port of Vancouver, and TriMet.
3. Active transportation and multimodal facilities that adhere to universal design principles to facilitate safety and comfort for all ages and abilities. Exceptional regional and bi-state multi-use trail facilities and transit connections will be created within the BIA. Opportunities will be identified to enhance active transportation facilities, with specific emphasis on local and cross-river connections between the region's Columbia River Renaissance Trail and the 40-mile Loop.
4. The construction of a seismically sound replacement crossing for the North Portland Harbor Bridge with three through lanes, northbound and southbound.
5. The construction of three through lanes northbound and southbound on I-5 throughout the BIA. May 2022 Interstate Bridge Replacement Program.
6. The inclusion of one auxiliary lane northbound and one southbound between Marine Drive in Portland and E. Mill Plain Boulevard in Vancouver to accommodate the safe movement of freight and other vehicles.
7. A partial interchange at Hayden Island, and a full interchange at Marine Drive, designed to minimize impacts on the Island's community; and improve freight, workforce traffic, and active transportation on Marine Drive.

8. A commitment to study improvements of other interchanges within the BIA.

9. Variable Rate Tolling will be used for funding, such as constructing the program, managing congestion, and improving multi-modal mobility within the BIA. The Program will study and recommend a low-income toll program, including exemptions and discounts, to the transportation commissions.

10. A commitment to establish a GHG reduction target relative to regional transportation impact, and to develop and evaluate design solutions that contribute to achieving program and state-wide climate goals.

11. A commitment to evaluate program design options according to their impact on equity priority areas with screening criteria such as air quality, land use, travel reliability, safety, and improved access to all transportation modes and active transportation facilities. The Program also commits to measurable and actionable equity outcomes and to the development of a robust set of programs and improvements that will be defined in Community Benefits Agreement.

Comments from the committee:

- Don Odermott asked about the performance on auxiliary lanes with travel demands on interchanges impacting emissions and climate measures on different sections shown from the technical analysis if changes are needed. Mr. Bihn noted there is a lot more work to be done. Anytime we do an environmental analysis updates can change. The one auxiliary lane provides better space and reduces omissions, balanced with consideration of the width of the highway especially over Hayden Island.

Mara Krinke added the NEPA analysis will include a lot more work on traffic with consideration of the auxiliary lane not only on the bridge but the north/south off the bridge also. Mr. Bihn added FTA requires these decisions to start and build the process as the project is developed.

- Chris Deffebach noted the significance of this project in the region. In the resolution it referred to a commitment to community benefit program. I was asked to have this described. Ms. Krinke noted there is an effort by the IBR team work with our Equity Advisory group and others to make sure we are developing guidelines and outcomes that are desired by the community and how we will achieve the hiring process and contracting; tangible logistics on the delivery of the project.

- Laurie Lebowsky added links in the chat regarding Community Benefit Agreements:

<https://allincities.org/toolkit/community-benefits-agreements>

<https://www.energy.gov/diversity/community-benefit-agreement-cba-toolkit>

- Gerik Kransky asked if the community partners have been identified as signatories to the community benefits agreement. Mr. Bihn noted they have not been defined yet.

Mr. Bihn read the resolution and Exhibit A.

- Jaimie Lorenzini approved of item 9 regarding variable pricing with a positive change in the exhibit from previous version. It was asked how the mode shift changed from 7% to 11% by

adding the auxiliary lane in modeling. Ms. Krinke noted the mode share was part of the modeling outputs but other elements were included, such as congestion reduction, travel time improvements and increased daily transit service. It was also noted the air quality measurements will be part of the EIS that was developed.

- Karen Buehrig noted in item nine of Exhibit A that *the Program will study and recommend a low-income toll program, including exemptions and discounts, to the transportation commissions*. It was asked what coordination was planned between this project and the work ODOT is currently doing on toll programming. Mr. Bihn noted full coordination on the toll program hasn't been done yet but expected to build on each other.

Garet Prior noted that ODOT is working in coordination with the IBR project and low-income toll program. Development for low-income accessibility on both sides of the river with both Oregon and Washington Transportation Commissions yet to weigh in on final decisions is not known yet. Oregon residents that qualify as low-income and have the transponder sticker on their vehicle and use tolling areas will receive the discount.

- Jaimie Lorenzini asked if the IBR team had an answer on the earlier public comment on phase ability for the project. Mr. Bihn noted it would be difficult to phase the bridge project with marine laws, bridge heights and the tunnel concept not a viable option. Ms. Krinke added there are complications issues working with Federal agencies, lane closures to maintain traffic with directional changes making phasing of the project not a feasible option.

**MOTION: To approve and recommend to JPACT Resolution 22-5273 and attachments as presented at this meeting.**

Moved: Don Odermott

Seconded: Lewis Lem

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.**

**Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) initial input on developing staff proposals** (Dan Kaempff, Metro) The presentation began with an update on the process to date. The timeline added a TPAC workshop on July 14 from 10 a.m. to noon focused on RFFA proposal development. The public comment runs from May 20 – June 21. Coordinating Committee input is due July 22. The online open house for public comments has received over 535 responses as of May 20. Draft report on comments will be given at the July 8 TPAC meeting; final report for July 14 TPAC workshop.

Kittelson & Associates, Inc. is working with Metro and the local agencies to identify and mitigate risks through the RFFA and Trails Bond application process. In considering potential risks, the project team divided project risks into two groups. The first group are risks (Project Management risks) that can be accounted for through project budget, with sufficient outreach and collaboration, with an adequate project scope, and/or with an appropriate timeline for project completion. The second group (Inherent Risks) are risks due to the complexities of a project that cannot be changed.

Evaluation considerations:

- Different funding types (RFFA vs Trails Bond)
- Project development phases: completed vs requesting funding
  - Projects requesting planning funds not penalized for not being far in project development: evaluation criteria applied is specific to project funding stage
  - Projects requesting construction funds are expected to have more detailed understanding of risks and cost estimate



Projects were grouped into four categories, first by the source of funding requested, then by the project phases to be funded through a funding award, as shown below:

- Projects seeking Trails Bond funds for Planning and Project Development
- Projects seeking Trails Bond funds for Construction
- Projects seeking RFFA funds for Planning and Project Development
- Projects seeking RFFA funds for Construction

There are five primary criteria areas in the Outcomes Evaluation. The **Equity, Safety, Climate and Congestion Relief** criteria are based on the RTP. The **Trails** criteria are based on the Bond Measure language. The Equity, Safety and Climate areas were used in rating all the projects. The Congestion Relief criteria was used only for RFFA projects, and the Trails criteria was only used for Trails Bond projects.

Staff intend to develop two or more draft funding proposals for TPAC and JPACT discussion and consideration, based on input received from those committees. These proposals are intended to illustrate different approaches to awarding funds. In July and August, TPAC has three opportunities to discuss and refine project funding proposals, leading to a TPAC recommendation in September.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig asked how the workshop July 14 would be used. How does TPAC interface with the Trails Bond funding, for individual projects and funding asked of both categories? Mr. Kaempff noted the workshop is intended to start working on different planned outcomes and prioritizing projects. By the time of the workshop the public comment input will be known and the assessment report. Staff is hoping to provide time for thoughtful conversation leading to project investment planning with this RFFA cycle.

It was noted the Trails Bond funding is solely Metro Council decision. As staff prepares recommendations to TPAC and JPACT they are taking into consideration input from the County Coordinating committees and the public to provide Metro Council informed proposals.

- Chris Deffebach commented that from the coordinating committee meeting the day before it was felt people like more local money than Federal dollars. It was asked how this might plan into the decision about Federal funding projects with consideration of local and Federal portions of funding in projects. It was asked if there was a measure of the significance with Regional Flexible funds with priorities across the region, and the opportunity to understand how they work across the region. It would be helpful to share priorities with long-term benefits across the region.

It was noted on the value of having ribbon cutting help leverage projects for improvements while also keeping some pipeline projects in line that have some financial strategy. Mr. Kaempff noted that all the applicants were asked to share a 1-2 page summary of their proposed project which are found on the RFFA webpage. If more details on projects are wanted, it might be possible to schedule brief presentations from the applicants.

- Eric Hesse agreed on the important consideration of federal dollars combined with local funding with project planning. It was also agreed that planning concepts matched with ratings and policy directions provide regional outcomes. Regarding a question on the criteria, Mr. Kaempff noted there were a number of different performance measures and evaluation

questions staff looked at in the criteria areas. Points all equal the same and stay relative to that particular criteria.

- Don Odermott noted the phenomenal amount of projects. It was recognized that with many projects and limited funding trying to prioritize these for regional funding is challenging. It was noted that we tend to use the tools we have (census track, data on diversity) for measuring equity. However, many industrial areas don't score well for equity since people don't live there. Considering employment reports, there are diverse workforce areas in the region that travel for work and recreation in these areas that do reflect equity. It was noted we should recommend projects on merits of their own and not prejudice projects that are not necessarily in residential areas.

Mr. Kaempff noted the equity focus areas as part of the evaluation/criteria with applications. It was encouraged for applicants to submit additional thoughts to their technical report that would show the equity benefits of their program.

- Gerik Kransky noted that responding to the great conversation on equity, mapping, and funding allocation decision making I'll briefly flag that Oregon DEQ recently received direction from the Legislature in the form of HB 4077 that requires multiple state agencies to create new and better environmental justice mapping tools. Hopefully we can continue to improve our approach here, text of the bill here:  
<https://olis.oregonlegislature.gov/liz/2022R1/Measures/Overview/HB4077>
- Chris Ford noted Metro has done a good job at providing equal rating at high levels. For longer term projects that run into challenges with census tracking these will require a holist view as part of the evaluation process to be sure all factors are taken into account.

JPACT has given direction on the importance to safety among RFFA projects, including trails systems, especially in equity areas. It was noted that when looking at the different weighting criteria balance the merits of projects, especially in advancing safety.

- Lewis Lem echoed Mr. Odermott's comments on equity. Similar situations with Federal grant applications evaluations through the Port of Portland are occurring. Future efforts of the Port's data can be shared. Further discussion on equity data for projects was encouraged.
- Allison Boyd asked if there was anything in the evaluation scoring that looked at whether or not a project had received previous project development funding in a RFFA cycle. If a project under this circumstance can apply and receive funding to move forward in the next cycle, it was suggested to consider project strategy planned that benefits the full project. Mr. Kaempff noted this information is available and can be referenced for consideration.

**2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy brief – Congestion Pricing Policy Development** (Alex Oreschak, Metro) The presentation began by showing the project timeline, currently sharing the draft 2023 RTP policy language with the committee and 2023 RTP policy recommendations. A brief review of what TPAC and MTAC provided to the project team was provided:

- Consider a new RTP section for congestion pricing, and update existing language
- Address program design, including meeting RTP goals
- Address low-income, elderly, and disabled populations, historically marginalized communities
- Include congestion pricing in the financial forecast and equitable funding assessment
- Consider how future corridors should include congestion pricing

Following this feedback staff recommended the following:

- NEW Ch. 3 congestion pricing section
  - UPDATE definitions for pricing terms
  - NEW congestion pricing policies
    - ODOT: I-205 Toll Project, I-5 Bridge Replacement, Boone Bridge Replacement, Regional Mobility Pricing Project
    - PBOT Pricing Options for Equitable Mobility
- Additional information
  - Overview of federal pricing programs (Section 129, VPPP)
  - Describe HB 2017 + HB 3055 tolling policies
  - Discuss potential revenue opportunities and limitations under Article IX, section 3A
- UPDATE other RTP Goals, Objectives, and other sections to include pricing
- REVIEW approach to congestion pricing in mobility corridors
- NEW Equitable Funding work; incorporate pricing

The definition of congestion pricing was defined as *Motorists pay directly for driving on a particular roadway or for driving or parking in a particular area. Congestion Pricing includes using variable road or parking tolls (higher prices under congested conditions and lower prices at less congested times and conditions). Congestion pricing has been demonstrated to be effective in encouraging drivers to change their behaviors by driving at different times, driving less, or taking other modes. As a result, congestion pricing can reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.*

New congestion pricing policies:

Mobility: Implement congestion pricing programs that improve regional mobility by managing congestion, reducing VMT, and increasing transportation options through investments in modal alternatives, including transit-supportive elements and increased access to transit.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig suggested it should say “improved system-wide mobility” so that it’s not just on one element of the system, and they should be viable transit supported elements.
- Chris Ford noted it was a good mobility policy language but it should consider “and/or increased transportation options”, which provides the ability for flexibility in policy language.
- Tara O’Brien asked if the terms “transit supported elements” and “access to transit” were defined elsewhere in RTP. Chair Kloster noted the glossary in the RTP will be reviewed as part of the draft with attention given to these terms.
- Chris Deffebach asked why anything after “managing congestion” is needed, given the range of mobility programs not listed (ITS, ramp timing coordination), so that we are not limiting ourselves by listing specifically how we do this. Mr. Oreschak noted project partners specifically called out these methods (reducing VMT, etc.) which speak to the outcomes. More refinement of the language will be done with the draft.
- Jaimie Lorenzini suggested including system completeness in the mobility definition. Missing are planned development and urban areas that are missing transportation mobility options. I also think "system completeness" language helps interface with Section 129-type programs that feel more infrastructure driven.
- Rachael Tupica asked how the movement of freight worked in the mobility definition. Chair Kloster noted this congestion pricing policy is being written as a tool for achieving the mobility policy, which will include freight mobility. Mr. Oreschak added sections of the RTP will be cross-referenced for further details.

- Don Odermott noted that when talking about congestion pricing, system completeness is a huge component of this. We have a vast inequity of transit resource availability in this region. But we have to have alternatives to give people the choice not to drive. The language regarding investments and mobility alternatives often don't have transit as viable alternatives outside Portland. Our region is not all the same place. System completeness has to include a certain foundational level of serviceable transit before we can start talking about congestion pricing to help people move into other modes of transit.
- Eric Hesse asked for more clarity with definitions between tolling and pricing, as well as facility and system wide. Mr. Oreschak noted RTP is trying to address all types of pricing, while ODOT is focused on tolling specifically. They do cross-reference however.

The committee was asked "Are there still gaps in the proposed congestion pricing policy that you would like to see addressed?" The City of Portland recommends the Climate Smart Strategy being updated, as well as having TSMO include mention of pricing in their strategy plan, and a refresh on the past pricing study with updated data.

- Chris Deffebach noted her comment on gap – there should be something about improving economic opportunities - the economic benefit as a goal is missing.
- Karen Buehrig agreed that policy lacked directly addressing the economic benefits, including freight movement.

The presentation resumed discussing the other new congestion pricing policies.

Equity: Implement congestion pricing programs that integrate equity and affordability from the outset.

- Include spotlight/example of ODOT's Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC) and/or City of Portland's Pricing Options for Equitable Mobility (POEM) Task Force

Safety and Diversion: Implement congestion pricing programs that reduce overall automobile trips, address traffic safety and minimize diversion.

Comment from the committee:

- Jaimie Lorenzini noted specific to 3.2.1.4, the safety and security policies don't feel quite robust enough. Perhaps we should consider safety for all modes? If traffic is diverting to facilities that are already unsafe for bike and pedestrian users, we ought to make it better.

Secondly, looking forward, could it be beneficial to be more flexible in the definition of travel spaces relative to the application of pricing? Right now, the conversation is centered on roadways and parking. At some point in the future, I could see the region talking about waterway traffic, traffic through vertical airspace, and other alternative travel spaces.

- Karen Buehrig suggested safety and diversion should be pulled apart with regards to the policy. In some ways it doesn't emphasize the variety of safety issues, not just related to diversion.

Climate: Implement congestion pricing programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles travelled while increasing access to low-carbon travel options.

Comment from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach noted reducing VMT is used a lot - when I think it sometimes means reducing peak period VMT. And also, let's not set ourselves up for an impossible goal since VMT will

continue to grow as our region and state grows - and how it is measured may just mean vehicles are not counted in one place but they occur elsewhere - look forward to learning more about how this is measured.

Emerging Technologies: Coordinate emerging technologies and pricing programs to create an integrated transportation experience for the users of the system.

Mr. Oreschak noted the 2018 RTP identified mobility corridors recommended for future corridor refinement plans. These corridor descriptions referenced pricing in a variety of contexts, but not in a consistent manner. Metro staff will be looking at corridor refinement planning work more comprehensively moving forward, including how to address pricing.

Lake McTighe presented information on the Equitable Transportation Funding. Equitable Funding considers transportation revenue sources in relation to a larger community context, seeking to avoid burdening those with lower incomes and to increase affordable and accessible mobility options. Equitable Funding contributes to a more equitable community where everyone has access to opportunities through affordable transportation options and are not paying a higher share of their income to support or access the transportation system.

The research on assessing Equity Impacts of Revenue Sources and Allocation will include:

- Who pays and what share of their income?
- Are there exemptions or subsidies?
- Are fees or fines tiered?
- Do payment methods create a burden?
- Do unpaid fines trigger penalties and cause debt?
- Does revenue source have a connection to what is funded?
- Does funding allocation support those with the greatest needs?

The process of support the 2023 RTP update through the Equitable Funding Report, RTP Finance Plan, Congestion Pricing, and future work was shown. A draft timeline was given with the RTP Phase 3 Revenue & Needs Analysis ongoing through the rest of 2022 with updates scheduled at TPAC and JPACT, with RTP Phase 4 Build RTP Investment Strategy in 2023.

Mr. Oreschak noted the coordination with the Oregon Highway Plan Tolling Policy Amendment between ODOT and Metro. Metro and ODOT are required to coordinate on the RTP and OHP through a "continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3 C)" planning process. The RTP Update and OHP Tolling Policy Amendment are occurring on parallel tracks. Concurrent updates to Metro committees on RTP + OHP will be provided at future meetings, and align language and policy goals to the extent possible, acknowledging differences.

Garet Prior presented information on the Oregon Highway Plan Toll Amendment process. With Oregon moving multiple major toll projects in the Portland region forward while building a statewide supporting program, the Oregon Highway Plan which identifies influential direction on the purpose and role of tolling, is in need of a refresh to address our current needs and goals for equity, climate, safety, a modern system, and sustainable funding, and policies need to be in place to inform rulemaking process for I-205 Toll Rate Setting that begins this fall.

It was noted what was in the amendment:

- Toll policies are primarily located in Goal 6 of the Oregon Highway Plan (last amended in 2012)
- Defining various terms that are used
- Clarifying the need and goals for tolling and toll-based congestion pricing
- Incorporate connections to equity and climate goals, initiatives, and targets
- Provide guidance on rate setting and use of revenues (e.g. balancing highway and transit and multimodal investment, low-income impacts, and diversion's impact on neighborhood health and safety)

And what is not in the amendment:

- Toll rates or toll revenue allocation
- Identification of specific investments that are funded through toll projects, which includes mitigation, are determined by the project sponsor and partners

A brief schedule was provided that included draft policy this late spring, public review this summer, and the earliest possible time for OTC adoption this fall. The committee was given ways to be involved and provided contacts.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Ford noted the coordination between ODOT and Metro with the amendment as part of the statewide planning process. There needs to be consistency between the agencies on the plan and policies.
- Tara O'Brien acknowledged the amount of work on the project. Regarding viability for transportation service improvements and areas where there will be pricing, thinking value to linking the viability of pricing corridors with transit pricing strategies and future transit investments is beneficial. It was also noted to think of ways to evaluate where the onus falls on improved transportation options in corridors that are meant to be priced, knowing that toll revenue cannot go directly to transit service at this time. It was also noted to think about how best to move forward on how congestion pricing really does have transit viable alternatives in the areas that are under consideration for pricing.

**2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Vision, Goals & Objectives** (Kim Ellis, Metro) The presentation began with an introduction of 2023 goals and objectives for initial discussion, leading to phase 2 of the 2023 RTP update. In phase 2 (the policy refinement framework), the planning focus will include:

- Refine vision, goals, objectives and targets
- Update policies related to congestion pricing, regional mobility, urban arterials, climate smart strategy and high capacity transit strategy
- Update data, tools and methods
- Review 2018 RTP project list
- Report on current conditions, system performance, Climate Smart Strategy and Congestion Management Process

The 2018 RTP goals were reviewed with key performance measures.

### **GOAL 1: Vibrant Communities**

The greater Portland region is a great and affordable place to live, work and play where people can easily and safely reach jobs, schools, shopping, services, and recreational opportunities from their home by walking, biking, transit, shared trip or driving.

**GOAL 2: Shared Prosperity**

People have access to jobs, goods and services and businesses have access to workers, goods and markets in a diverse, inclusive, innovative, sustainable and strong economy that equitably benefits all the people and businesses of the greater Portland region

**GOAL 3: Transportation Choices**

People throughout the region have safe, convenient, healthy and affordable options that connect them to jobs, school, services, and community places, support active living and reduce transportation-related pollution.

**GOAL 4: Reliability and Efficiency**

The transportation system is managed and optimized to ease congestion, and people and businesses are able to safely, reliably and efficiently reach their destinations by a variety of travel options.

**GOAL 5: Safety and Security**

People's lives are saved, crashes are avoided and people and goods are safe and secure when traveling in the region.

**GOAL 6: Healthy Environment**

The greater Portland region's biological, water, historic and cultural resources are protected and preserved.

**GOAL 7: Healthy People**

People enjoy safe, comfortable and convenient travel options that support active living and increased physical activity, and transportation-related pollution that negatively impacts public health are minimized.

**GOAL 8: Climate Leadership**

The health and prosperity of people living in the greater Portland region are improved and the impacts of climate change are minimized as a result of reducing transportation related greenhouse gas emissions.

**GOAL 9: Equitable Transportation**

The transportation-related disparities and barriers experienced by historically marginalized communities, particularly communities of color, are eliminated.

**GOAL 10: Fiscal Stewardship**

Regional transportation planning and investment decisions provide the best return on public investments.

**GOAL 11: Transparency and Accountability**

Regional transportation decisions are open and transparent and distribute the benefits and burdens of our investments in an equitable manner.

Upcoming meetings were given where discussion on refining vision, goal and objectives for the 2023 RTP will take place. Feedback on questions provided and further feedback was asked of the committee by June 13. Chair Kloster noted we are working toward a public comment period spring 2023.

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse noted the interest in covering all the bases with defined outcomes, but how challenging this can be. It was suggested we try to crosswalk or bundle some topics that might be a way to simplify the process.
- Chris Ford agreed on the merits on consolidating the materials. Goal 5, Safety and Security sounds like a large item to work on, but important to stay consistent and maintain the investment projects over time. It was suggested to hold in-person committee meetings on in-depth discussions if possible.
- Tara O'Brien noted different timelines in presentations at this meeting. It was asked if there would be a listing of all RTP related discussions at TPAC, MTAC, and JPACT that could be referred to. Ms. Ellis noted she is updating the master calendar that includes all the RTP presentations and will have this sent out soon.

**Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC** (Chair Kloster) – Comments received:

*Can TPAC agendas include links to individual documents within the packet as JPACT agendas do? With very long packets it is difficult to sift through all the information in a long 200+ page document.*

*Another way to may TPAC more user friendly would be to create a packet where the individual items can be accessed through links, similar to how JPACT materials are assembled.*

**Adjournment**

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

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder



Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, June 3, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	6/3/2022	6/3/2022 TPAC Agenda	060322T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	5/27/2022	TPAC Work Program as of 5/27/2022	060322T-02
3	Memo	5/26/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (during May 2022)	060322T-03
4	Memo	5/10/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Request to Review 2018 RTP Project List and Submit Requested Information by June 10	060322T-04
5	Memo	5/10/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Metro RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Request to review and identify proposed “housekeeping” changes to RTP Network maps by June 10	060322T-05
6	Draft Minutes	5/6/2022	Draft Minutes from TPAC May 6, 2022 meeting	060322T-06
7	RESOLUTION NO. 22-5271	N/A	FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING AND ADDING TO THE 2021-26 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TWO ODOT PROJECTS ENABLING PROJECT PHASES TO MOVE FORWARD AND ADDRESSING FUNDING SHORTFALLS (JN22-13-JUN1)	060322T-07
8	Exhibit A	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 22-5271	060322T-08
9	Staff Report	May 24, 2022	June 2022 Formal/Full Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendment Narrative Summary, Staff Report for Resolution 22-5271	060322T-09
10	RESOLUTION NO. 22-5272	N/A	FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING OR ADDING TO THE 2021-26 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TRIMET’S NEW WILLAMETTE SHORELINE RAIL REPAIR PROJECT AND ADDRESSING ODOT NEEDED PROJECT FUNDING INCREASES (JN22-14-JUN2)	060322T-10
11	Exhibit A	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 22-5272	060322T-11
12	Staff Report	May 24, 2022	June 2022 Formal/Full Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendment Narrative Summary, Staff Report for Resolution 22-5272	060322T-12

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
13	RESOLUTION NO. 22-5273	N/A	FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE INTERSTATE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM MODIFIED LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	060322T-13
14	Staff Report	May 27, 2022	Interstate Bridge Replacement Project (IBR) Modified Locally Preferred Alternative Resolution	060322T-14
15	Attachment 1	May 5, 2022	MEMORANDUM: OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION FOR MODIFIED LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	060322T-15
16	Memo	May 27, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Developing Investment Proposals for Regional Funding Decisions (RFFA and Trails Bond)	060322T-16
17	Memo	May 26, 2022	TO: Dan Kaempff, Ted Leybold, and Robert Spurlock, Metro FROM: Camilla Dartnell, PE, Russ Doubleday, and Hermanus Steyn, PE, Kittelson RE: 2025-27 Regional Flexible Funds and Trails Bond Risk Assessment	060322T-17
18	Handout	N/A	DRAFT 25-27 Project Ratings (Uncategorized)	060322T-18
19	Report	May 2022 (UPDATED 5/27/22)	Regional Funding Allocation: Outcomes Evaluation Report 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Parks & Nature Trails Bond funding	060322T-19
20	Memo	May 27, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Brief – Congestion Pricing Policy Development	060322T-20
21	Attachment 1	June 2022	Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Draft Congestion Pricing Policy Language	060322T-21
22	Attachment 2	June 2022	OHP Toll Policy Amendment Overview	060322T-22
23	Attachment 3	May 2022	Feedback from April 2022 TPAC and MTAC Workshop	060322T-23
24	Memo	May 27, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Feedback Requested on Existing 2018 RTP Goals and Objectives	060322T-24
25	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1. Existing 2018 RTP Goals and Objectives	060322T-25
26	Attachment 2	N/A	Attachment 2 – 2023 Regional Transportation Plan – Existing 2018 RTP Goals and Objectives Overview – For TPAC Feedback	060322T-26
27	Memo	June 1, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: May 2022 Report - Traffic Deaths in the three counties	060322T-27

<b>Item</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
28	Slide	5/25/2022	June traffic deaths report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	060322T-28
29	Handout	N/A	Climate and transportation expert panel	060322T-29
30	Presentation	June 3, 2022	June 2022 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolutions 22-5271 and 22-5272	060322T-30
31	Presentation	June 3, 2022	IBR Modified LPA Process & Resolution	060322T-31
32	RESOLUTION NO. 22-5273 updated	N/A	FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENDORSING THE MODIFIED LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE INTERSTATE BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	060322T-32
33	Attachment A to Resolution 22-5273 updated	May 27, 2022	DRAFT MODIFIED LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION	060322T-33
34	Presentation	June 3, 2022	2025-2027 Regional Funding: RFFA + Trails Bond Developing Discussion Options	060322T-34
35	Presentation	June 3, 2022	RTP Congestion Pricing Policy Development	060322T-35
36	Presentation	June 3, 2022	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Update Goals and Objectives	060322T-36