

# Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**  
Date/time: Friday, August 5, 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  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Tara O'Brien  
Karen Williams  
Laurie Lebowsky-Young  
Lewis Lem  
Idris Ibrahim  
Katherine Kelly

**Alternates Attending**

Jamie Stasny  
Sarah Paulus  
Mark Lear  
Peter Hurley  
Dayna Webb

**Members Excused**

Eric Hesse  
Jay Higgins  
Don Odermott  
Chris Ford  
Jasmine Harris  
Rob Klug  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Jeremy Borrego  
Rich Doenges

**Guests Attending**

Andre Lightsey-Walker  
Carly Rice  
Chris Smith  
Cindy Dauer

**Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Port of Portland  
Community Representative  
City of Vancouver

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
City of Portland  
City of Portland  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County

**Affiliate**

City of Portland  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro & Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

**Affiliate**

The Street Trust  
City of Gresham  
  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District

**Guests attending, (continued)**

Cody Field	City of Tualatin
Francesca Jones	Portland Bureau of Transportation
Jean Senechal-Biggs	City of Beaverton
Jessica Pelz	Washington County
Matchu Williams	
Mike McCarthy	City of Tualatin
Neelam Dorman	
Seth Brumley	Oregon Department of Transportation
Terry Kearns	
Tova Peltz	Oregon Department of Transportation
Will Farley	City of Lake Oswego
One unidentified caller	

**Metro Staff Attending**

Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager	Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Regional Transportation Planner	Cindy Pederson, Research Center Manager
Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner	Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Robert Spurlock, Senior Transportation Planner	Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner
Margi Bradway, Dep. Director PD& Research	Andrea Pastor, Senior Regional Planner
Connor Ayers, Legislative Coordinator	Matthew Flodin, PD&R Intern
Shannon Stock, Program Assistant	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. 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**  
Chris Deffebach announced that Andy Back will retire August 12 after 30 years of service with the Washington County Planning & Development Services Division, the last 10 years serving as Director. Erin Wardell has been appointed Interim Director and in addition will continue managing her planning group at this time.
- **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 July 2022. For any questions on the monthly MTIP amendment projects you may contact Mr. Lobeck directly.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The monthly update was provided on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties in 2022. In July, ten people died in traffic crashes in in the region. Six in Multnomah County, two in Clackamas County and two in Washington County. So far this year, at least 65 people have died in traffic crashes. Thirty-nine percent of the traffic deaths were pedestrians.

Mark Lear asked if the number of unidentified fatalities was unusual. Ms. McTighe noted notifying the next of kin, and time needed with crash investigations caused a delay for individuals to be identified for reports.

- **2018 RTP Completed Projects** (Kim Ellis) The summary memo in the packet reports on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) projects that have been completed since 2018 or for which construction will be completed by December 2023. Metro staff will update the project status of each of these projects in the RTP Project Hub to reflect they are completed and as a result no longer need to be included in the RTP project list.

Chris Deffebach asked if it was possible to summarize total local funding vs state or federal funding on projects completed list. It could inform future discussions on federal, state funding when it comes to revenue forecasts.

- **2023 RTP Schedule Update** (Kim Ellis) It was noted the RTP timeline and anticipated schedule for Metro Council and regional advisory committees briefings schedule was included in the packet. A further update on this will be provided at the MTAC/TPAC August 17 workshop.
- **Climate Expert Panel Report from June 22** (Kim Ellis) It was noted the video and summary from the Climate Expert Panel forum have been posted online. Other materials were included in the packet.
- **Recommended Oregon Highway Plan map amendments from Jurisdictional Transfer Study** (Chair Kloster) The report was provided on behalf of John Mermin. The 2020 Regional Framework for Highway Jurisdictional Transfer project included a work element for the project consultant to review the function of existing state highways in the Portland region for consistency with their current Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) classification. The consultant analyzed the function of all the highways in comparison to their existing classifications and recommended downgrading the OHP classification of four highways. These recommended actions are detailed in the packet memo. For further feedback direct questions to John Mermin.

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** – none received

**Consideration of TPAC Minutes from July 8, 2022**

Jaimie Lorenzini asked that minor edits/typos be accepted that she will submit as part of the motion.

**MOTION: To approve minutes from July 8, 2022.**

Moved: Jamie Lorenzini

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

**ACTION: Motion passed to include the minor edits/typos, with one abstention; Karen Williams.**

**Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) and Trails Bond draft staff recommendations** (Dan Kaempff & Robert Spurlock, Metro) Dan Kaempff and Robert Spurlock presented information on draft funding recommendation options for Regional Flexible Funds/Parks Bond. Examples of possible funding packages were described that would result from using project outcomes ratings along with public input, sub regional priorities and additional information to select projects. The examples are intended to show comparisons of using different approaches for project selection of how to balance regional priorities with local considerations and the available funding.

**Equity + Safety Baseline** – A baseline example is shown to illustrate a funding package derived from funding projects in ranked order of the averages of their Equity and Safety ratings. Projects are funded in order until there is insufficient funding available to fully fund the next project down the list. This leaves \$4.275 million unallocated in the Parks Bond package and \$4.07 million unallocated in the RFFA package.

**Example 1: Baseline, with Adjustments to Parks Bond projects** – This example illustrates a funding package for the Parks Bond based on cost adjustments and direction from Parks staff on how these funds should be allocated. In this example, all of the trails projects seeking funding from either source are funded, with some projects receiving reduced funding. As in the baseline, funding is allocated to the RFFA projects based on their outcomes ratings through the 57th Ave/Cully Blvd. project. There is \$4.07 million remaining, which is insufficient to fully fund the next project in line, 7th Ave. There are several projects requesting lower amounts which could be funded with the remaining funds.

**Example 2: Baseline, with top two priority projects funded** – Metro staff considered modifying the Bond Adjusted Baseline (Example 1) by ensuring each sub region’s first priority project is funded (for Washington County, the highest outcome rated project was included). However, the outcome of doing so is the same as the Parks Bond Adjusted Baseline Example 1 as all of the sub regional priority projects were already included. So for Example 2, Metro staff included each sub region’s top two priority projects into the funding package. For Washington County, Beaverton Creek Trail is assumed to be the second priority project based on its outcomes rating. Compared to Example 1, this package funds Sandy Blvd. and Willamette Falls Dr. and does not fund Fanno Creek Trail, MLK Blvd., and the Tigard – Lake Oswego Trail. There is \$1.46 million remaining, which is insufficient to fully fund the next project in line, Fanno Creek Trail. There are several projects requesting lower amounts which could be funded with the remaining funds. In this example, the project receiving the highest level of public input – Fanno Creek Trail – would not be funded. But the on-street project with the highest level of public input – Willamette Falls Drive – would be funded.

**Example 3: Baseline, with next best performing projects in Washington and Clackamas Counties** – Example 3 starts with the Example 1 Baseline and utilizes its remaining \$4.07 million to select the next two best performing and affordable projects located in the Washington and Clackamas sub regions. These two sub regions are potentially receiving proportionally less investment than the other two sub regions due to the total amount of funding they requested. Additionally, Allen Blvd was the next highest performing project of all remaining unfunded projects from Example 1 while Willamette Falls Blvd. is the second priority project of the Clackamas sub region and received the most public comments of any project in that sub region. In this example, no additional projects could be funded as it is \$147,000 over the forecasted available revenues. Metro staff feels this slight overage is close enough to the forecasted amount that it could be managed through MTIP programming adjustments.

Mr. Spurlock noted additional bond considerations to funding, which includes:

- Public comment
- Geographic balance and racial equity
- Cultural resources
- Preference not to federalize Bond funds
- Construction vs. project development (Bond must fund capital assets)

TPAC was requested to provide input to help develop a draft RFFA recommendation to JPACT for action in the September TPAC meeting. TPAC input in this meeting will also be considered in developing a staff recommendation for the Parks Bond funding, which will be presented to Metro Council in September.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig acknowledged the work Metro staff has done preparing the recommendations for consideration. Interest was expressed for example 2 that shows how we can creatively invest in the region while also investing in equity and safety as two top priorities. Acknowledgement was given for the letter from the City of Fairview in support of funding with the Sandy Blvd. project, which is an important arterial with safety priority needed.
- Jaimie Lorenzini agreed with the benefits to projects such as Sandy Blvd. Regarding the un-allocated funding in the RFFA pool this is in scenario 2, it was suggested to be strategic with funding lower cost project development projects in consideration of the number of resources coming online now. Investing in project development would place the region in a more competitive position to leverage other funding in the future.
- Allison Boyd noted Multnomah County support with scenario 2. The East County Technical Advisory Committee gave support for this option. The County has 2 top priorities with RFFA projects and 2 top priorities with the Trails Bond funding. It was noted Sandy Blvd. was a big concern for the community with safety.
- Mark Lear appreciated the focus on safety and equity held with conversations at TPAC and JPACT. The City of Portland had a concern with example 2 where the MLK project that scored well in criteria listings was not funded. The City appreciates the outcome based focus of the examples, but more conversations may be needed to get us closer to where final recommendations are made.
- Chris Deffebach noted that WCC didn't rank options because it was thought all projects should be funded and balanced between construction and pipeline projects. If recommending option 2, some prioritizing has yet to be done for projects that are not funded. Washington County felt with the geographic parity a higher amount of un-allocated funds in scenario 2 should be provided to their projects. Fanno Creek Trail was suggested as one project for full funding. Other projects noted for funding discussion was Tigard and Allen Blvd. It was noted the community pass grant just opened which could provide opportunities for funding projects that are significant in the region.
- Mark Lear clarified for the minutes the City of Portland is not saying we support option 2 and then find a way to fund what little is left to make MLK work, but take the outcomes based approach and find an agreeable method of prioritizing projects with as much funding as possible to address safety and equity. Ms. Deffebach agreed with this approach noting further discussions on projects at TPAC and JPACT.
- Karen Buehrig asked what the next steps were from here. Would JPACT have the conversation next? Will TPAC have a proposed recommendation to consider at the September meeting?
- Mr. Kaempff noted the excel spreadsheet link in the packet. It was noted the funding estimates are exactly that; estimates. The range of funding available is \$47.4 million with some latitude of going over the estimated funding as past cycles have done. Mr. Leybold added this is a funding forecast based on our Federal authorization bill. Part of managing the process is assigning projects in the amount of money they need in phases each year. We are committed to making up the balance if short in the next allocation process. Mr. Kaempff added TPAC generally supports option 2, with further discussion on the recommendation from the City of Portland and Washington County. JPACT will discuss this next, then staff hopes to bring one recommendation for consideration to TPAC at their next meeting.
- Jamie Lorenzini requested that as part of the report to JPACT, express interest in developing a pipeline of projects with options.

- Karen Buehrig agreed with more input from the jurisdictions following the meeting to help develop the best option moving forward. It was felt helpful to start from a specific option to anchor projects, then understand options with the remainder of funds.
- Mark Lear understood Ms. Buehrig's comments but noted the City of Portland was not yet ready to start at option 2 as the base for the recommendation. We are still in the negotiation phase of discussions looking at all options.
- Tara O'Brien asked if the City of Portland and Washington County could provide a better explanation of negotiations for JPACT considerations.
- Chris Deffebach noted that WCCC thought that option 2 was a winner if the County could get the rest of funding to complete the Fanno Creek project as a priority, and supports the Allen Blvd. project. WCCC meets again and will discuss further prior to JPACT meeting for their input.

**Region 1 draft 100% project list for the 2024-27 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

(Tova Peltz, Oregon Department of Transportation) Tova Peltz provided information on Region 1 draft 100% project list 2024-27 STIP. The STIP is a 4-year capital program for federal transportation funds. The 24-27 STIP covers federal fiscal years (FFY) 2024-2027, which start on October 1<sup>st</sup>. ODOT develops a STIP every three years. The FFY '24 is already programmed; the present effort focuses on FFY's '25, '26, '27.

The 2024-27 STIP began with the funding allocation process in 2020. Themes of initial STIP public input included support to increase Non-Highway funding to advance equity, address climate, and enhance accessibility and mobility for all, support for Fix-It investments and reluctance to cut spending on bridge and pavement preservation to avoid accelerating system deterioration, and support for Enhance Highway investments to reduce congestion and facilitate economic development.

The project selection process now underway includes financial analysis and project sequencing ("programming") which includes project scoping and inflation costs consideration with programming. The Region 1 STIP website link was shared with information on past, current and future STIPs, description of funding categories and draft project lists being scoped for the 24-27 STIP, information on the 24-27 STIP Highway Enhance Program, and STIP comment form.

The public engagement process for the 24-27 STIP timeline includes:

- Summer 2022: R1 shares draft 100% lists with regional stakeholders for review and input
- Late 2022 / Early 2023: Engagement opportunities statewide on full draft 100% STIP
- Summer 2023: OTC adopts 24-27 STIP

The 24-27 STIP 00% Draft List Notes includes noting the list is draft until OTC action in one year, numbers do not yet include UMO projects, totals include IJJA funds but not 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue JT dollars, many programs are statewide and data driven, and some projects appear in both 21-24 and 24-27 STIP, with different phases. The draft 100% project list will be updated and appear on the webpage as changes are made.

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear acknowledged the work between ACT and JPACT in working together more productively in addressing these issues. Noting that from meetings around the state there is a question on how much progress we are making on equity. Region 1 and our MPO has the most concentration of diverse population. But are we allocating funding that reflects this for safety projects across geographic areas. A specific high crash area (Lombard/Denver) was noted for



such an example. Ms. Peltz noted she felt fortunate to be in conversations in how the state is addressing equity as this. How we distribute our resources to benefit communities that have been underserved regarding transportation infrastructure from a safety perspective is fairly new to ODOT. Region 1 is taking the lead in many ways addressing this. Difficult discussions with planned funds distributions are happening across the state and across planned programs.

- Karen Buehrig about the example with 2 enhanced projects on the 100% project list, if already adopted by OTC or if OTC would adopt all of the 100% list as a whole set. Ms. Peltz noted the whole list would be adopted by OTC, including the enhanced program projects. It was asked how the Great Streets program would be developed with the 100% list. Ms. Peltz noted the methodology is still being sorted out with ODOT. Each region will have their own ideas on how these are developed; some projects may be under construction and need more funding to complete, others may not currently be on the list but meet criteria and priorities.
- Peter Hurley noted the recently adopted rules with Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities by DLCDC with significant changes regarding VMT reductions and capacity expansion projects. It was asked what ODOT is doing in regard to this with the STIP. Ms. Peltz noted she would find others to better answer this and forward the contact information. In development with the STIP there was a tool incorporated in scoping projects to evaluate climate methods. The evaluations are being analyzed including the 100% list projects for impacts and climate targets. It was suggested to invite the state climate office staff to TPAC to provide further information. It was noted the urban mobility projects were not included in the list. Why and when would they be included? Ms. Peltz noted they are still working on details with the projects. Based on programming requirements it is expected they'd be available sometime in September.
- Chris Deffebach asked what kind of comments would be most helpful beyond more funding for projects. Ms. Peltz noted at this point not much shifting of funds statewide is likely. What could be helpful, based on the project list, knowing if there are adjacent projects nearby on the local system or other projects in the works that are expected for future scoping. Discussion is already underway on the 2027-30 STIP. The more information learned about corridor improvements planned, and project design and constructed that add value to communities such as corridor-wide improvements with collaboration to get the work done is helpful.
- Ted Leybold noted the creation of the Great Streets program was part of the advocacy that came from this region for using discretionary funding with a comprehensive approach for corridor-wide safety programs. It was suggested that Region 1 help prioritize projects nominated and schedule time on a TPAC agenda with ODOT staff to discuss further.

**2024-2027 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Performance Evaluation – Approach & Methods** (Grace Cho) Information was provided on the proposed approach to evaluating the 2024-2027 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The performance evaluation of the 2024-2027 MTIP is organized by two tracks:

- Evaluating progress towards RTP priorities
  - Evaluating progress towards federal performance targets
- Each track has a proposed approach as they each have different requirements and/or guidelines in demonstrating federal compliance.

The 2024-2027 MTIP performance evaluation will take a multi-pronged approach to assess the four-year package of investments. The multi-pronged approach includes the following:

- Investment analysis of the 2024-2027 MTIP
- System performance analysis of the 2024-2027 MTIP towards RTP priorities

- Performance analysis towards federally mandated performance targets

#### Investment Analysis Evaluation Approach

The investment analysis will assess the level of investment the region plans to make across different categories over the next four years. Some category examples include: type (e.g. capital investment, planning, operations, preservation and maintenance), mode (e.g. active transportation, transit, roads and bridge, etc.). The investment analysis – to the extent practicable – will also compare investment across categories from the 2021-2024 MTIP and 2018 RTP to the current proposed MTIP. The analysis of the investment profile will provide general size, scale, and profile of the investment package to help place in context the performance of the four year program.

#### System Performance Evaluation Approach

The system performance evaluation will apply a similar approach to how the 2018 RTP evaluated the long-term package of investments. This means the evaluation will apply a system-wide analysis of the overarching investment program and transportation projects programmed in the MTIP will not be evaluated independently. The evaluation will primarily be a quantitative assessment focused on assessing the four RTP priority areas: safety, equity, climate, and mobility.

#### Federal Performance Target Evaluation Approach

As part of federal requirements, the performance evaluation of the 2024-2027 MTIP will also assess how the investment profile makes progress towards federally mandated performance targets. The federal performance target analysis will focus primarily in demonstrating how the mix of investments proposed for 2024 through 2027 advance the region towards achieving federal performance targets for asset management, environment, national highway system performance and freight mobility, and safety.

Next steps planned:

Fall 2022 – 2024-2027 MTIP project list finalizing and performance evaluation preparation

Winter 2022/2023 – Run MTIP performance evaluation, results, and develop initial findings

Spring 2023 – Report out results, release 2024-2027 MTIP public review draft, respond to public comment

Summer 2023 – 2024-2027 MTIP adoption

Comments from the committee:

- Laurie Lebowsky-Young noted looking at page 10 of the packet regarding Climate Performance Measures and saw that C-Tran stops were excluded and was wondering why. Ms. Cho will answer this as a follow up from the meeting.
- Chris Deffebach noted this analysis includes Federal, state and transit agencies projects, but seems to evaluate against our regional goals, objectives and targets. What projects are assumed to be included in the 24-27 cycle as the basis for the analysis? Ms. Cho noted the STIP includes regional significant projects in the region where part of the funding is local. The evaluation will include this subset of projects. Any missing regional project investments that are not seen with evaluations should be included in the context of the STIP to show the complete investments of projects. It was noted that long-range forecasting and work with RTP currently is helping provide current data for the evaluation.
- Karen Buehrig asked what have we learned from the previous cycle evaluation and helping us be more informed for this cycle. Ms. Cho noted our data showed our region is moving away from our safety targets despite increased funding as a top priority. As such this reflects in the emphasis on the RFFA project selections. The STIP evaluations inform us how we advocate at



other funding tables and discussions with OTC with funding categories and amounts. Information highlighted at MTIP evaluations provides leverage and tradeoffs for limited resources while also building on past cycles for better developed goals and targets.

- Tara O'Brien asked how the performance measures impacted not reaching our targets help inform future changes that may need to be made. Ms. Cho noted the mandated Federal performance targets that are required, but have some discretion with funding when targets are not made. Less explicit are targets from the RTP. The intent of the MTIP evaluation is to highlight now we are doing in that 4-year program. Interim strategies working toward ambitious goals can help evaluate progress.
- Karen Williams appreciated the proposed refinements to some of the measures, in particular looking at access to jobs and frequent transit for jobs. It was asked if part of the assessment took into account active transportation infrastructure and pedestrian access. Ms. Cho noted the system completeness measure applies in part to multiple priorities. Staff is looking at pedestrian infrastructure in the refinement phases with direction from regional connectivity policies. The access issues can be addressed in these completeness plans.

Ms. Williams noted in Table 6. Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program – Excessive Delay and Mode Share Targets percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (Non-SOV) travel increasing. It was asked where does this come from and why is it rising. Ms. Cho noted that due to the completion of State Implementation Plan (SIP) requirements in October 2017 and the region not being in violation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for federally regulated criteria pollutants, the Portland region is no longer required to report on performance monitoring of the Excessive Delay and Mode Share targets. The region aims for an achievable target with projected growth, generally increased incrementally.

- Mark Lear thought we could be effective working on these evaluation elements to get to some level of sub-regional analysis feedback to our groups. Evaluation is not just studying what we're doing and need to do, but planning changes needed with time and schedules. Besides the Federal requirements, other factors for evaluation need to be analyzed, given the number of regional projects and local priorities. The trust between ODOT, agencies, jurisdictions and Metro is needed to make the RTP better than ever.

**TPAC member restructure update/material links between TPAC & JPACT** (Chair Kloster) The presentation shown was presented to Metro Council in June for a proposed approach for more meaningful and sustained community representation on TPAC. The committee's role with recommendations to JPACT, the work of the committee that has evolved over time, and community representation to date was reviewed.

Chair Kloster noted the challenges community members face serving on the committee, and recent equity efforts made to support members. The proposal brought to Metro Council included:

- To seek representatives from Community Based Organizations (CBOs) who can bring transportation experience and organizational capacity to the role
- Continued focus on bringing BIPOC representation to the committee
- Track participation for two years and consider further adjustments, if needed

At their June 21 meeting the Metro Council approved this approach and directed staff to proceed with a community member recruitment, as follows:

- New focus on CBOs for candidates

- Continued focus on racial equity and diversity
- Continue existing reforms (*stipends, safe space protocols, staff support and DEI training*)

The memo provided to Metro Council as the basis of the approach was added to the packet, providing further details.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Williams asked about outreach and recruitment to youth serving on TPAC, with strategy planned to reach youth via High Schools or other educational institutions. Chair Kloster noted the CBOs were being recruited for their depth of knowledge and connection to community. Youth members often serve on CBO boards and could be recruited to TPAC this way also.
- Tara O'Brien asked about the role of alternates with CBOs, and how would recruitment significantly change this time around if changes are needed to the bylaws. How does this compare to MTAC? Chair Kloster noted MTAC bylaws are contained within MPAC bylaws, with specific positions and alternates spelled out. Depending on lessons learned this 2-year time, TPAC bylaws could be changed if needed for alternate designations. CBOs alternate roles are still being worked out. The emerging leaders section in the proposal: *three leadership development positions as alternates for the six community representatives whose primary role would be helping CBOs develop capacity in transportation advocacy at Metro and around the region* could help answer questions.
- Karen Buehrig suggested working with TPAC members to help in outreach and recruitment efforts with CBOs. It was suggested to find ways to access information easier, such as the meeting packet. Chair Kloster noted other help for new community members is possible prep meetings with packet run-throughs. Metro Council looks for geographic balance of representation from around the region on committee which will include this recruitment.
- Chris Deffebach appreciated having more voices at the TPAC table and offered to help with information shared on topics to prepare for productive discussions at TPAC.

Chair Kloster concluded the presentation with notation of Metro Council appointments for these new TPAC community members in December, and their terms starting in January 2023.

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

*Could we please make transcripts savable? Thanks!*

No time remained on the agenda to address this issue.

### **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, August 5, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	8/5/2022	8/5/2022 TPAC Agenda	080522T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	7/29/2022	TPAC Work Program as of 7/29/2022	080522T-02
3	Memo	7/26/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (during July 2022)	080522T-03
4	Memo	7/29/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: July 2022 Report - Traffic Deaths in the three counties	080522T-04
5	Memo	7/29/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Projects Completed Since 2018	080522T-05
6	Handout	7/29/2022	2023 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN Timeline and anticipated schedule for Metro Council and regional advisory committees briefings May to December 2022	080522T-06
7	Handout	N/A	Climate and transportation expert panel summary	080522T-07
8	Handout	6/22/2022	June 22, 2022 Climate Smart Expert Panel Registrant List	080522T-08
9	Handout	6/22/2022	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Climate and Transportation Expert Panel Presentation Slides	080522T-09
10	Memo	7/26/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Metro RE: Highway classification changes for consideration in Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) updates	080522T-10
11	Minutes	7/8/2022	Draft minutes from July 8, 2022 TPAC meeting	080522T-11
12	Memo	8/1/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Draft funding recommendation options for Regional Flexible Funds/Parks Bond	080522T-12
13	Comment letter	July 11, 2022	Clackamas County Coordinating Committee comments regarding Prioritization of the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) and Metro Parks Trail Bonds	080522T-13
14	Comment letter	July 29, 2022	City of Fairview comments regarding support Multnomah County's RFFA application	080522T-14

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
15	Links to spreadsheets	8/5/2022	Links to excel spreadsheets RFFA Technical Scores on projects and Bond examples	080522T-15
16	Handout	July 29, 2022	DRAFT 100% 2024-2027 STIP Projects, ODOT Region 1	080522T-16
17	Memo	8/5/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2024-2027 MTIP – Performance Evaluation Approach and Methods	080522T-17
18	Slide	8/5/2022	July traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	080522T-18
19	Presentation	8/5/2022	Draft funding recommendation examples for 2025-2027 Regional Funding: RFFA + Parks Bond	080522T-19
20	Presentation	8/5/2022	Draft 100% List 2024-2027 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program	080522T-20
21	Presentation	8/5/2022	2024-2027 MTIP Performance Evaluation Approach	080522T-21
22	Presentation	8/5/2022	Community Voices at TPAC Proposed approach for more meaningful and sustained community representation	080522T-22
23	Memo	5/16/2022	TO: Council President Peterson, Metro Councilors From: Margi Bradway, Deputy Director, Planning, Development and Research Department RE: Community Representation on the Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)	080522T-23