

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday, September 2, 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
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Karen Williams
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Lewis Lem
Katherine Kelly

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas 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
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
City of Vancouver

Alternates Attending

Jamie Stasny
Jessica Berry
Sarah Paulus
Peter Hurley
Dayna Webb
Mike McCarthy
Glen Bolen
Gerik Kransky

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Multnomah County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Members Excused

Allison Boyd
Don Odermott
Idris Ibrahim
Jasmine Harris
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Rich Doenges

Affiliate

Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro & Cities of Washington County
Community Member
Federal Highway Administration
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Arleta Neighborhood Association

Affiliate

Mt. Scott

Guests attending, (continued)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Brenda Bartlett | Washington County |
| Chris Smith | Citizen Activist |
| Cody Field | City of Tualatin |
| Francesca Jones | Portland Bureau of Transportation |
| Garet Prior | Oregon Department of Transportation |
| Holly Smith | City of Fairview |
| Jean Senechal Biggs | City of Beaverton |
| Jeff Owen | HDR |
| Jim Sjulín | 40 Mile Loop Land Trust |
| Neelam Dorman | Oregon Department of Transportation |
| Nick Fortey | Federal Highway Administration |
| Peter Swinton | Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District |
| Nathaniel Price | Federal Highway Administration |
| Stephanie Noll | Oregon Trails Coalition |
| Vanessa Vissar | Oregon Department of Transportation |
| Vivian Satterfield | VERDE |
| 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 |
| Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner | Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner |
| Robert Spurlock, Senior Transportation Planner | Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner |
| Margi Bradway, Dep. Director PD& Research | Clint Chiavarini, Senior GIS Specialist |
| Connor Ayers, Legislative Coordinator | Matthew Flodin, PD&R Intern |
| Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Planner | Grace Stainback, Associate Transportation Planner |
| Jess Zdeb, Intern | John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner |
| Ken Lobeck, Senior Transportation Planner | Marne Duke, Senior Transportation Planner |
| Noel Mickelberry, Assoc. Trans. Planner | Ramona Perrault, Council Policy Advisor |
| Thaya Patton, Sr. Research & Modeler | Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner |
| Summer Blackhorse, 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 Ford announced that Neelam Dorman has been appointed the new Oregon Department of Transportation Region 1 Planning Manager. Ms. Dorman joins Glen Bolen as an alternate member on the TPAC roster representing ODOT.

Chair Kloster announced plans for public meeting spaces at the Metro Regional Center being developed. Currently the building is closed to the public.

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Chair Kloster referred to the memo in the packet on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during August 2022. For any questions on the monthly MTIP amendment projects contact Mr. Lobeck directly.
- **Fatal crashes update** (John Mermin on behalf of Lake McTighe) The monthly update was provided on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties in 2022. So far this year, at least 73 people have died in traffic crashes. Thirty-seven percent of the traffic deaths were pedestrians.
- **Agenda for upcoming RTP Urban arterials JPACT/Council workshop** (Chair Kloster) The fact sheet provided in the packet gives direction from the policy brief earlier this year. Sept. 29 this subject will be the focus of the next JPACT/Metro Council workshop. Agenda and materials for the meeting will be sent out the week before.
- **Regional Mobility Policy Next Steps** (Kim Ellis)
The Regional Mobility Policy Update Project Timeline and 2022 Engagement Schedule was noted in the packet. The deadline for the recommendation from JPACT and Metro Council has been extended to Dec. The revised draft will be provided to TPAC in October. Appreciation was given to all the comments and feedback on this issue.

Eric Hesse noted comments provided by PBOT around speed thresholds with efficiencies and actions in the future. It was asked if valuable to prioritize in next steps. Jay Higgins agreed on the need for more time to discuss speed which is hard to understand how thresholds help move forward actions with materials shown so far. Ms. Ellis notes this is some of the research being done now, and part of the work bringing back to the committee in October.

- **TSMO project solicitation opportunity** (Caleb Winter) It was announced that following discussions at the July and August TransPort meetings, the opportunity to propose projects to implement the 2021 TSMO Strategy is now open. This project solicitation process starts by sending Metro a letter of interest by Sept. 19. Full information on the process is available on the website: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/regional-tsmo-strategy/tsmo-resources>
- **Application opportunity from US Convention of Mayors** (Eliot Rose) A funding resource was announced from efforts by the US Conference of Mayors and League of Cities to support small and mid-size cities to apply for infrastructure projects from funding created from the new infrastructure bill. It was encouraged to coordinate with Metro if applying. The link for this resource was shared: <https://localinfrastructure.org/>

Public Communications on Agenda Items

Stephane Noll, Oregon Trails Coalition

Support of the RFFA staff recommended projects was given for trails funding. Benefits for safety and critical funding investments for trails from these funds was described.

Vivian Satterfield, VERDE

Background on the engagement with neighborhoods, agencies and organizations to build trust for safety issues for pedestrians, cyclists and walkers on streets and roads was provided. Support for funding considerations with RFFA and Trails Bonds funding was given.

Jim Sjulín, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust

The trail projects on the staff recommended RFFA list are all worthy projects and their overall share of RFFA funds is reasonable. Thanks to everyone for supporting off-street trail projects.

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from August 5, 2022

MOTION: To approve minutes from August 5, 2022.

Moved: Karen Williams

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 22-5283 (Ken Lobeck, Metro) The September FFY 2023 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment regular bundle represents the first formal MTIP amendment for FFY 2023. It primarily is a “corrective” and “clean-up” amendment completing required changes or adding projects that will obligate early during FFY 2023 or were above the amendment threshold for administrative modifications and require a formal/full amendment.

The amendment bundle contains phase slips, funding changes, new projects, name/description updates and is being processed under MTIP Amendment SP23-01-SEP. The changes/additions need to occur early in FFY 2023 to position them properly for their planned fall phase obligation or next federal approval step which the MTIP and STIP is part of the approval steps. The bundle contains a total of 15 project amendments. A summary of the projects and amendment actions within the bundle are shown in the packet staff report.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked why such a large area displayed for the district. Were we putting in C-Tran type improvements also? Mr. Lobeck noted the map showed the areas of projects with the amendment only making changes to SMART and TriMet projects.
- Tara O'Brien asked if this was the last opportunity for additional amendments in the process. Mr. Lobeck noted there will be MTIP formal amendments each month, with administrative amendments throughout the month as needed. Staff is going through obligation targets for 2023 now that will incorporate transit reviews at the same time with opportunities to make changes.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 22-5283 consisting of additions or changes to 15 projects enabling federal reviews and fund obligations to then occur in early Fall of 2022.

Moved: Tara O'Brien

Seconded: Jessica Berry

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

2025-27 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Recommendation (Dan Kaempff, Metro) The presentation began with a brief overview of staff recommendations with discussion on any proposed changes or alternative recommendations. A reminder of the process for selecting projects for Trail

Bond funding and RFFA funding was presented. The bond proposal will be presented to Metro Council September 29. The RFFA proposal will be presented for adoption at Metro Council October 13.

Mr. Kaempff reminded the committee the RFFA staff recommendation focused on equity and safety outcomes, were based on example 2 from August discussions, invests throughout the region; top 2 priority projects from Portland and counties, and totaled 10 projects. The Parks Bond recommendation are 12 projects that TPAC and JPACT have reviewed and provided input on, and if necessary, may be revised based on RFFA discussion at this meeting.

Staff is recommending Step 22: \$47,300,000 (pending TPAC recommendation, JPACT approval) with Resolution 22-5284. It was noted that Step 1: \$105,400,186 (investments previously identified in RFFA Program Direction, IJA funding memo) would total with Step 2 the 2025-27 RFFA: \$152,700,186.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Williams asked about the timing of availability of funds from the different categories. Mr. Kaempff noted the Parks Bond funds would start earlier, intended to initiate IGA processes soon. Robert Spurlock agreed estimating the availability of bond funds the first quarter of 2023. The RFFA funds would begin FY 2024, starting in October 2023.

MOTION: To approve staff recommendations of 25-27 RFFA Step 2 funding package to JPACT

Moved: Jessica Berry

Seconded: Jay Higgins

Discussion on the motion:

- Jaimie Lorenzini wanted to highlight the importance of the Tigard - Lake Oswego Trail project not recommended for Bond funding. The criteria numbers did not tell the whole story due to the conditions with people avoiding for safety and costs of industrial traffic. Strategies for funding with limited dollars is challenging. It was suggested that consideration be given for adding 2 projects if funds become available beyond our funding forecast in the RFFA recommendations that is consistent with project forecast planning with ODOT. These 2 projects are Lakeview Blvd. and Allen Blvd.
- Ted Leybold noted that correct, we are making this allocation based on forecast. Actual dollars come in each year in preparation to fill. The Federal authorization bill sets the amount of how much money will come into the region. Actual preparations come in annually. We track it in our financial plan and then, if more money comes in that what we have forecasted, we pick this up in the next allocation process. We adjust the bottom line with the next allocation.

If less money comes in than forecasted, and if some projects delayed the next allocation cycle, we track the available funds in the next allocation cycle. If all projects moved on schedule and less money came in we'd have to select a project to delay for delivery. This is our current process.

This would be a new process if selecting possible projects if funds came in above forecasted levels. But we would need to be very specific about which project came first, if a partial allocation would be OK, and have specifics worked out and at what point would we make that determination in terms of funding coming in. The next RFFA allocation process is in 3 years, 2025 the first year of appropriation funding coming in for projects we are picking right now. We need to work through the technical questions in how we'd select backup projects.

Ms. Lorenzini confirmed this understanding but suggested that between now and JPACT staff recommendation an option could be presented with this. Mr. Leybold acknowledged we could provide an option, noting the current practice picks up the next allocation process before the appropriations happen, but it would be essentially taking revenues from the next allocation process to put these projects in line first and pre-ump the next allocation process.

- Chris Deffebach appreciated Ms. Lorenzini’s comments. These are 2 major arterials that are hard to fund. If there was some way to frame when funds become available to be considered while dealing with uncertainties now and how things quickly change this might be an option. It was asked for clarification on when the bond debts would be retired. Mr. Leybold noted the current payment is \$63m/3 year cycle. Payment is reduced in 2028. The bond is fully retired in 2034. Ms. Lorenzini noted that smaller projects are important and having a “wait list” helps awareness of funding opportunities that with lower cost projects become achievable.
- Jessica Berry appreciated the discussion and recognized urban arterials are a big issue and need attention. A clarification was asked that are we saying we need to make a decision about this in the RFFA pot if there is more money we could spend on these 2 projects, or we are identifying them as priorities and when the next cycle comes along they will be funded. Mr. Leybold noted he described how the Federal funding process works and how the RFFA process positions itself relative to that. TPAC can recommend to JPACT putting projects in a reserve if in some point actual allocations provide more money than these are funded at some triggering point. We need to define what that is, or what could be more appropriated for RFFA money prior to or before the next allocation cycle.
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted interest in creating a plan for this allocation cycle that acknowledges the uncertainty experienced from circumstances and changes in the last few years in our region.

MOTION: To amend the motion to recognize the importance of the Lake View Blvd. and Allen Blvd. projects and hold them in reserve in the event if additional funding is available this RFFA cycle.

Moved: Jaimie Lorenzini

Seconded: Mike McCarthy

Discussion on the amended motion:

- Lewis Lem asked if the staff report created a recommendation list below the line of projects for proposed funding. It was also noted, in order to meeting the current budget, staff did not recommend full funding to projects that are on the list where gaps appear from amounts requested. Mr. Kaempff noted staff did not create a list of projects prioritized beyond what was recommended. All of the projects in staff recommendations are requested for their full requested amounts (RFFA projects), but there are 3 reductions in the Trails funding from requested amounts.
- Jay Higgins asked for clarification on the 2 projects with this amended motion. It was noted both projects are for planning and design options project development.
- Karen Williams noted she would not support the amended motion, based on public process, not the merits of the projects. Discussion on reserved project lists should have occurred prior to this when the process for prioritizing projects were first discussed, and allowing for uncertainties could have come from full public sessions. Creating a new process at this point seems unnecessary with consequences for other projects now allowing to compete.
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted this amendment is not to circumvent the public process but create a project list with considerations from input around the region for future funding available.
- Eric Hesse suggested a possible friendly amendment that would not specifically call out the 2 projects. But note that if potential funding was available in the allocation cycle consideration

of projects might be given. It was noted that JPACT could consider a follow-up process this way.

CALLED MOTION: To amend the motion to recognize the importance of the Lake View Blvd. and Allen Blvd. projects and hold them in reserve in the event if additional funding is available this RFFA cycle.

ACTION: Support: 4 votes Against: Support: 6 votes Abstaining: 1; Chris Ford

Chair Kloster noted that the committee could direct staff to include discussion from this recommendation to JPACT with the original motions.

Further discussion on the original amendment motion:

- Chris Deffebach agreed it was important to share TPAC comments with JPACT. The policy significance is we fund a lot of trails, but harder to get funding for arterials. Thoughts shared will improve the process for the next cycle.
- Lewis Lem suggested TPAC going back to regional groups and asking what their next recommended projects might be with possible backlog of worthy projects that were highlighted. Mr. Leybold noted this could be good direction for staff to incorporate into the staff report to JPACT, and additional elements of options of how to gather additional information and priorities from the subregions in terms of reserve list cycle of projects in a follow-up process or articulating a need for funding projects if more funding is available.
- Jessica Berry acknowledged the need for funding arterials and the difficulty doing so. It was suggested to say that if there is that gap or additional funding we do look at those next projects without naming them specifically, but recognize the RFFA funds should be for projects not eligible for trail funds, but if RFFA funds become available we look at projects that were close for funding and identify those for what's available.
- Jaimie Lorenzini agreed there is a balance between needs with limited funding. It's important to direct funding as needs change.
- Mike McCarthy acknowledged staff efforts on this issue. It was agreed that arterials didn't seem to score as proportionately well as other projects, so looking at how to be better prepared next cycle is recommended. It was noted there is a portion of the region underfunded that has become a recurring pattern theme and becoming difficult to stop.

ORIGINAL MOTION: To approve staff recommendations of 25-27 RFFA Step 2 funding package to JPACT. *Staff report to JPACT additions listed following the action on the motion.*

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Kloster listed additions to the staff report to JPACT:

- Worthy projects were left on the table
- Emphasize what was not funded (arterials)
- Changes in funding (Federal and other sources) and leveraging these opportunities
- Parities, sub-allocations considerations
- If funding comes in greater than forecasted, creating a system getting money out faster with consideration of projects not approved this cycle
 - Should we always do this?
 - Emphasize subregional engagement with County coordinating committees (and others) with prioritized projects of next projects.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Vision, Goals & Process Update (Kim Ellis) The presentation began with an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the RTP as a key tool for implementing the 2040 Growth Concept and Climate Smart Strategy, the RTP 2023 timeline, and how community, business and partners being engaged.

Ms. Ellis described work being done to refine the policy framework, and the revenue and needs assessment analysis. A January - June 2023 schedule of Build RTP Investment Strategy was given.

Jan. 6 Official call for projects and programs released and on-line project database system available

Jan. 29 Deadline: Lead agencies submit preliminary list of priority projects and programs

Feb. 17 Deadline: Lead agencies submit required project information through online system, Form A on public engagement and endorsement letters from governing body and coordinating committees

March – April Metro staff evaluates investment packages and seeks public feedback on draft project list

May – June JPACT and Metro Council discuss results and public input and provide feedback on finalizing public review draft plan

A checklist on what agencies can do now to begin preparing for the Call for Projects. Staff members Ally Holmqvist and Lake McTighe are the Metro contact for the Call for Projects.

The committee was asked to give feedback on the draft Vision and Goals for the 2023 RTP.

Vision: Everyone in the greater Portland region will have safe, reliable and affordable travel options that support equity, resilient, healthy and economically vibrant communities.

Draft Goals:

1. Equitable Transportation: Transportation system disparities experienced by Black, Indigenous and other people of color and people with low incomes, are eliminated.
2. Climate Resilience: People, communities and ecosystems are healthy and resilient, carbon emissions and other pollution are reduced and travel by transit, walking and bicycling is increased.
3. Safe System: Serious crashes are eliminated and people are safe and secure when traveling in the region.
4. Mobility Options: People and businesses can reach the goods, services and opportunities they need by affordable travel options that are safe, connected, convenient, reliable, accessible, and welcoming for all.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig appreciated the good work pulling the different goals together. In terms of goal 1 and equitable transportation it was thought valuable information was missing, and more was needed. At the end of the draft sentence, it was suggested to *add and barriers of people of color, low income people, older adults and people with disabilities and other historically marginalized communities face meeting their travel needs are removed.*

A fifth goal was suggested to be taken from the combined goals in goal 4 (mobility options) calling out the value of vibrant and prosperous communities. It was felt a need to uniquely support our economy, industrial areas and employment with land use and transportation.

- Chris Deffebach appreciated the elevated goals with more visibility. Agreement was given to Ms. Buehrig's suggestion on goal 1. Goal 2 highlighting climate and highlighting the environment, it was thought to recognize the importance of climate strategies. Goal 3 on safety and security was thought to be more specific and provide clarity on how safety is measured, and calling out seismic/earthquake readiness with transportation routes in the goal. It was agreed that economic prosperity be pulled out of the mobility goal to a separate goal.
- Eric Hesse supported the efforts to consolidate goals and felt the workshops were helpful with JPACT on issues. Regarding the climate strategies and green house emission reductions goals it was important to directly address this in the RTP goals. The word "resilience" might not be the correct way to summarize the factors, as opposed to climate or environmental leadership. VMT reduction was important to be called out in the actions.

The safe system goal was a good approach but adding "all modes" in the language might be helpful. Discussion on security importance was acknowledged, especially from an equity perspective. It was suggested that adding acting on qualitative and quantity information around safety measures, not just traffic safety, was helpful.

Regarding mobility options, what is missing is efficiency and how we manage growth. It was suggested to build on measurable actions with equity, which has an urgency for this. It was felt accountability gets buried in the equity goals and needs to be called out more. How the entire framework fits together for a comprehensive plan benefits the region.

- Chris Ford agreed with Ms. Buehrig's comments around a proposed 5th goal that calls out support of economic prosperity and business development.
- Mike McCarthy also agreed with the suggested goal 5 to support equity in economic prosperity for vibrant communities.
- Sarah Paulus agreed with previous comments. It was noted of the importance to define security and how this can be measured and evaluated in a well-rounded way. It was agreed that adding language around seismic resiliency into the safety goal should be included.
- Karen Buehrig commented on the process document, referring to page 194 of the packet. *Form A. Public engagement and non-discrimination certification and documentation for projects submitted in the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects*. It was noted "The state also outlines requirements for public engagement in transportation system planning activities by cities and counties in the Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)". Concern was given with a plans previously approved that may not meet these new requirements. Consideration was asked to add language about projects adopted into plans after these 2022 rules were given, so that compliance would be given. It was noted the NEPA analysis is important but it will take time to process with various projects and not enough time to complete for this level of analysis would be completed for the RTP timelines.

Ms. Ellis agreed and thanked Ms. Buehrig for the flagging this. The complete analysis won't happen by January 2023 and language will be added to provide the flexibility for compliance. The new information requirements for NEPA projects was noted. Ms. Ellis agreed there will be further workshops on the subject for these discussions as well.

- Chris Ford agreed on the new form language suggestions and having further discussion at the workshop. If already in the existing RTP it should qualify and this is really about moving forward. If we need to have a discussion about this, we can. It's hard to retrofit past work, and

believes we are not looking at the RTP process be legitimizing past planning efforts but going forward on planning efforts. It was asked when TPAC would see the draft language for “Goal 5” around economy? Ms. Ellis noted draft updates to the materials including a new goal for the JPACT packet. Thank you for your feedback today!

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Pricing Policy Development (Alex Oreschak, Metro) The presentation began with a brief overview of where we are in the regional pricing policy development for the RTP. Staff addressed input from TPAC on revised draft policies and action items that included:

- Reframe – Pricing instead of Congestion Pricing
- Better address revenue reinvestment
- Include language on freight, and on other pricing programs (such as Waterfall Corridor timed-use permits)
- Include description of which jurisdictions might implement pricing
- Remove/adjust references to EFAs and high injury corridors
- Revisions to policies and actions
- Policy 6 should focus on user experience, not emerging tech

Not yet addressed included:

- Policy background/context and connection to the RCPS and the action items
- Clarification on how policies and actions relate to RTP goals and objectives
- How different pricing projects can be regionally coordinated.
- Separate actions from policies – group action items together at end of section
- Remove changes to motor vehicle network policies
- Remove language around VMT reduction
- Change “diversion” to “rerouting” and define what level of diversion is an impact that warrants addressing

A new introduction was drafted that includes:

- Types of pricing, what jurisdictions might implement
- Why is pricing important?
- Benefits to freight and businesses
- Revenue reinvestment
- Constitutional restrictions
- Other state and regional pricing work
- Federal pricing programs
- Regional Congestion Pricing Study summary

Other changes to the policy language were noted:

- Revisions to policies and action items to reflect input
- Refocus Policy 6 more on user experience
- Action items are now numbered
- Placeholder for additional policy context
- Direction for additional work on Chapter 8
- Continue coordination with OHP amendment

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach noted there are many policies that are coordinated with this; much to evaluate. Regarding potential opportunities for revenue and investments the use of these funds for road improvements and operations and maintenance are not being seen. This is

particularly important for the road user charge. We are dealing with options to replace declining road funds. Policy 12 is challenging due to the level of detail needed. We don't have the resources needed to do a pricing study on every project. More comments will be provided by the Oct. 28 deadline.

- Eric Hesse noted the policy statements seem more aspirational and lack details. Written comments by the deadline will be given on these. It would be useful to understand the next process steps and what parts will be used in the interim. A gap was recognized with pricing strategies between state, local and regional entities. How these could be combined for effective strategies and implemented would be helpful.
- Karen Buehrig noted that Chapter 8 could include answers on tools to move the regional approach to pricing forward. Unsaid in the report is pricing revenues would also be used for different infrastructure investments. This needs to be more explicit and laid out. Unclear is how and when different actions would be applied. Goals are articulated well, but how and when they are implemented seem disconnected.

The Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Draft Pricing Policy, Policy Actions, Definitions, Background & Context document reads “With transportation pricing, our region can have better, faster transit, cleaner air, fewer hours sitting in traffic, and more equitable access to jobs and opportunities.” The next sentence reads “Pricing programs will need to be carefully designed to ensure the process to develop them is equitable, revenue is reinvested equitably and to support regional goals, diversion on local streets is mitigated, and pricing strategies are interoperable throughout the region.”

The first sentence needs to happen before the second one. More needs to be done in how the pricing program is implemented next to be designed better to achieve goals. There should be a transition connecting the two sentences.

- Chris Ford appreciated the comments from the committee and Metro staff work. ODOT felt this is trending well but not yet ready for advancement. Infrastructure and seismic reconstruction funding sources need to be listed as a revenue source. They are hard to specify in revenue funding. The regional balanced view aims to look at overall network affect in terms of mobility, climate, air quality and more at individual locations. We are looking at not being boxed in with perfection expected, but balanced over the region.

It was noted this pricing policy will carry into the next RTP and hold longer term conversations. Policy 12 was questioned on why changes were made. Referring to page 235 of the packet,

Policy 12 – Prior to adding new motor vehicle capacity ~~beyond the planned system of motor vehicle through lanes~~, demonstrate that system and demand management strategies, including access management, transit and freight priority, ~~and value~~ pricing, ~~and~~ transit service and multimodal connectivity improvements cannot meet regional mobility, safety, climate, and equity policies adequately address arterial or throughway deficiencies and bottlenecks. These changes were concerning regarding state transportation planning rules where investments are planned for land use development and challenges to the land use system. Future workshops and discussions can be planned to discuss further.

- Lewis Lem noted his main question is whether 'revenue raising' is considered by Metro to be an explicit goal in consideration of pricing options, in addition to congestion relief.

There are different implications between benefit from raising revenue or benefit to relieve congestion.

To conclude the presentation Mr. Oreschak noted that at the JPACT 8/18 meeting, it was requested that staff develop a comment letter to address regional concerns. A draft letter will be shared after this meeting, with comments requested by Sept. 7. The letter will be shared with JPACT in advance of their Sept. 15 meeting.

Next steps with the revised 2023 RTP Policy and Action Items presented at committees was given. TPAC is asked to provide written feedback by October 28. Updated policies will be incorporated in RTP chapter updates and chapter updates brought to TPAC in late winter/ early spring.

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

I remain concerned that the online experience remains “inside baseball” that excludes community members of TPAC and members of the public. Suggest a special prep session/workshop that TPAC members can join to answer questions and support them.

Chair Kloster noted prep sessions may be possible moving forward once we bring community members coming onboard in January.

Please note that attendees are not able to see the votes from those members who do not have their cameras on. For these key votes and discussion, it’s important that we be able to see who is voting how. (Or alternately, you need to call the roll?)

Chair Kloster noted we are working through logistics heading into the new year and will share more at upcoming meetings.

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, September 2, 2022

| Item | DOCUMENT TYPE | DOCUMENT DATE | DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION | DOCUMENT No. |
|------|---------------------------------|---------------|---|--------------|
| 1 | Agenda | 9/2/2022 | 9/2/2022 TPAC Agenda | 090222T-01 |
| 2 | TPAC Work Program | 8/26/2022 | TPAC Work Program as of 8/26/2022 | 090222T-02 |
| 3 | Memo | 8/24/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (during August 2022) | 090222T-03 |
| 4 | Memo | 8/25/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: August 2022 Report - Traffic Deaths in the three counties | 090222T-04 |
| 5 | Slide | 8/24/2022 | August traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties | 090222T-05 |
| 6 | Handout | 8/26/2022 | Safe and healthy urban arterials fact sheet | 090222T-06 |
| 7 | Handout | 8/24/2022 | REGIONAL MOBILITY POLICY UPDATE PROJECT TIMELINE AND 2022 ENGAGEMENT SCHEDULE | 090222T-07 |
| 8 | Draft minutes | 8/5/2022 | Draft minutes from August 5, 2022 TPAC meeting | 090222T-08 |
| 9 | Resolution 22-5283 | N/A | Resolution 22-5283 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING NEW OR AMENDING EXISTING PROJECTS IN THE 2021- 26 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) TO COMPLETE REQUIRED PHASE SLIPS AND MAKE REQUIRED CORRECTIONS TO MEET FALL OBLIGATIONS OR FEDERAL APPROVAL STEPS (SP23-01-SEP) | 090222T-09 |
| 10 | Exhibit A to Resolution 22-5283 | N/A | Exhibit A to Resolution 22-5283 | 090222T-10 |
| 11 | Staff Report | 8/24/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: September FFY 2023 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 21-5283 Approval Request | 090222T-11 |
| 12 | Attachment 1 | N/A | Attachment 1: OTC July 14, 2022 Annual Amendment Staff Item | 090222T-12 |
| 13 | Memo | 8/26/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Recommendation to JPACT for Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 projects | 090222T-13 |

| Item | DOCUMENT TYPE | DOCUMENT DATE | DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION | DOCUMENT No. |
|------|-----------------------|---------------|---|--------------|
| 14 | Handout | N/A | 2025-2027 RFFA staff recommendation | 090222T-14 |
| 15 | Memo | 8/26/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Proposed 2023 RTP Vision and Goals | 090222T-15 |
| 16 | Attachment 1 | 8/26/2022 | Draft Vision Statement for 2023 RTP | 090222T-16 |
| 17 | Attachment 2 | June 2022 | JPACT and Metro Council RTP Workshop 1 Summary | 090222T-17 |
| 18 | Memo | 8/26/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 RTP Call for Projects – Preliminary Information | 090222T-18 |
| 19 | Attachment 1 | 8/25/2022 | Tentative Schedule and Timeline for Call for Projects and Plan Adoption | 090222T-19 |
| 20 | Attachment 2 | N/A | Form A. Public engagement and non-discrimination certification and documentation for projects submitted in the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects | 090222T-20 |
| 21 | Handout | 8/25/2022 | Project Timeline and 2022 Discussions and Engagement Activities | 090222T-21 |
| 22 | Memo | 8/26/2022 | TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Policy Brief –Pricing Policy Development | 090222T-22 |
| 23 | Attachment 1 | August 2022 | Metro Regional Transportation Plan – Draft Pricing Policy, Policy Actions, Definitions, Background & Context | 090222T-23 |
| 24 | Attachment 2 | August 2022 | Feedback from July 2022 TPAC Meeting | 090222T-24 |
| 25 | Attachment 3 | August 2022 | JPACT & Council Workshop #2 (July 28, 2022) Summary | 090222T-25 |
| 26 | Public comment letter | 9/1/2022 | From: Jim Sjulín, Board Member, 40 Mile Loop Land Trust Re: Regional Flexible Funds Allocation for 2025-2027 | 090222T-26 |
| 27 | Presentation | 9/2/2022 | September FFY 2023 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 22-5283 | 090222T-27 |
| 28 | Presentation | 9/2/2022 | 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds: TPAC recommendation to JPACT | 090222T-28 |
| 29 | Presentation | 9/2/2022 | 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Update | 090222T-29 |
| 30 | Presentation | 9/2/2022 | RTP Pricing Policy Development | 090222T-30 |