

# Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**  
Date/time: Friday, March 3, 2023 | 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  
Tara O'Brien  
Chris Ford  
Karen Williams  
Laurie Lebowsky-Young  
Lewis Lem  
Bill Beamer  
Ellie Gluhosky  
Andre Lightsey-Walker  
Danielle Maillard  
Jasia Mosley  
Indi Namkoong  
Katherine Kelly

**Alternates Attending**

Sarah Paulus  
Dayna Webb  
Gregg Snyder  
John Serra  
Glen Bolen  
Gerik Kransky

**Members Excused**

Mike McCarthy  
Jasmine Harris  
Rob Klug  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Ned Conroy  
Rian Sallee

**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  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Port of Portland  
Community member at large  
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon  
The Steet Trust  
Oregon Walks  
Community member at large  
Verde  
City of Vancouver

**Affiliate**

Multnomah County  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

**Affiliate**

City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County  
Federal Highway Administration  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

### **Guests Attending**

Adam Fiss  
Aria Wong  
Bryan Graveline  
Camilla Dartnell  
Chris Smith  
Cody Field  
Cora Potter  
Dan Riordan  
Garet Prior  
Jean Senechal Biggs  
Jeff Owen  
Jessica Pelz  
Matchu Williams  
Matthew Hall  
Max Nonnamaker  
Nick Fortey  
Peter Swinton  
Vanessa Vissar  
Will Farley  
1 unidentified phone caller

### **Affiliate**

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Nelson Nygaard  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
Kittelson & Associates  
  
City of Tualatin  
TriMet  
City of Forest Grove  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Beaverton  
HDR  
Washington County  
SE Uplift  
WSP  
Multnomah County  
Federal Highway Administration  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of Lake Oswego

### **Metro Staff Attending**

Alex Oreschak, Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Dan Kaempff, Daniel Audelo, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jodie Kotrlik, John Mermin, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Matt Bihn, Ted Leybold, Thaya Patton, Tim Collins

### **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. 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**

- **Welcome to new TPAC community representatives** (Chair Kloster) A welcome was given to the new six TPAC community members starting their terms of service on the committee. These are: Bill Beamer, community member at large, Ellie Gluhosky, OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon, Andre Lightsey-Walker, The Street Trust, Danielle Maillard, Oregon Walks, Jasia Mosley, community member at large, and Indi Namkoong, Verde.
- **Updates from committee members around the region** (Chair Kloster)  
Chris Ford announced the public comment period on the I-205 Toll Project Environmental Assessment Study has been extended to April 21. The link for these documents was posted in chat: <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/tolling/Pages/I-205-Toll-Project-Environmental-Assessment.aspx>

Eric Hesse announced a Reconnecting Communities Federal Grant the City of Portland received, with the fact sheet link shared in chat:

<https://www.transportation.gov/sites/dot.gov/files/2023-02/RCP%20Fact%20Sheets%202022.pdf>

It was announced that Peter Hurley, our colleague from the Portland Bureau of Transportation had passed away recently after battling cancer. He was acknowledged for this dedication and service with climate and environmental issues.

Chair Kloster announced Metro had a position opening for Associate Transportation Planner. The work by this individual will involve the RTP and CFEC efforts.

Chris Ford announced that ODOT is also hiring for the position of Associate Transportation Planner. The link was shared in chat: [https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/en-US/SOR\\_External\\_Career\\_Site/details/Associate-Transportation-Planner--Underfill-Option-REQ-121010?q=planner](https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/en-US/SOR_External_Career_Site/details/Associate-Transportation-Planner--Underfill-Option-REQ-121010?q=planner)

Chris Deffebach announced that Jessica Pelz accepted the position of Policy Analyst with the Land Use & Development group at Washington County. There is an open position in the planning group for Senior Transportation Planner which will be posted soon. Erin Wardell's former role as Manager of the transportation group is still open. Applicants are encouraged to apply.

Eric Hesse noted that PBOT is also hiring Senior planners:  
<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/portlandor/jobs/3890519/senior-city-transportation-planner-planner-sr-city-transportation-open-until?keywords=senior%20planner&pagetype=jobOpportunitiesJobs>

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Chair Kloster referred to the memo in the packet on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during early to mid-February 2023. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) A background was provided to new members on why this report was given each month to the committee, which tells of the traffic impact from crashes and acknowledges the human toll. The update was provided with the names of people killed in fatal crashes within the three counties of the region over the previous time period.
- **2021-22 Annual Listing of Federally Obligated projects** (Ted Leybold) Background information was provided on the annual Federally Obligated project report. An obligation occurs when the US Department of Transportation legally commitments to pay for the share of a project's costs, allowing the project's lead agency to begin project spending with assurance that federal share of costs will be reimbursed. The most recent three fiscal years have seen a significant increase in the obligation of federal funds, primarily due to increase in Coronavirus relief funds provided to help offset losses in state and local transportation agency revenues. For questions on the report the committee can reach out to Ted Leybold or Jodie Kotrlik.

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

### **Consideration of TPAC Minutes from February 3, 2023**

With corrections to spelling in the proposed draft, minutes from TPAC February 3, 2023 were approved by the committee.

Abstaining: Bill Beamer, Ellie Gluhosky, Andre Lightsey-Walker, Danielle Maillard, Jasia Mosley, Indi Namkoong.

**Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 23-5319** (Ken Lobeck, Metro) This proposed MTIP formal amendment contained one project: a combined ODOT street upgrade and Beaverton pedestrian enhancement project. The project is being re-scoped to reflect only the Beaverton pedestrian enhancement scope elements. The scope change separates the Beaverton Canyon Road Pedestrian Enhancements from its previous assimilation within the larger series of ODOT OR8 operational safety upgrade projects.

Due to delivery challenges, Beaverton's portion is separated out as a stand-alone project to avoid further conflicts with the OR8 operational safety upgrade projects. The scope and funding for Key 18758 now reflects the planned Canyon Road Pedestrian Enhancements as part of Beaverton's planned streetscape upgrades.

The revised project now will be a separate pedestrian upgrade project renamed OR8 Canyon Rd Pedestrian Enhancements project. The project cost has been revised to be \$5,475,000, which includes RFFA award, ODOT contributing funds, and new HIP Exchange Funds. ODOT will remain the lead agency to deliver the project. The construction year has been revised to be FFY 2024.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Williams asked for clarification on the term "delivery issues" and what was meant by it not working. Mr. Lobeck noted there were overlapping scoping activities between agencies that were challenging. Mr. Leybold added the original plan was for this project to be integrated with other projects planned by ODOT on Canyon Road 8 in a similar timeframe and be delivered as one. However, the definition of scope and cost changes meant this project had to slow down and become its own project, to allow other improvement elements on projects planned by ODOT to proceed on schedule.
- Chris Deffebach noted this is an example of how long it takes to get projects delivered. Acknowledgement was given to the City of Beaverton and staff for the work done for these improvements.

**MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 23-5319 which will complete the re-scoping action to the OR8/Canyon Rd project.**

Moved: Chris Deffebach

Seconded: Gregg Snyder

**ACTION: Motion passed with four abstentions; Jasia Mosley, Bill Beamer, Ellie Gluhosky, Danielle Maillard**

**Draft 2023-24 Unified Planning Work Program** (John Mermin, Metro) Mr. Mermin presented an overview of the Unified Planning Work Program document with the purpose and organization. The committee will be reviewing the document in track changes for recommendation to JPACT at the TPAC April 7 meeting. Prior to this the committee is asked to look for opportunities for projects to be better coordinated, look for ways to add clarity to project narratives, identify any missing information in the project narratives, and identify missing project narratives.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig asked if the cost elements at the bottom of each narrative reflected the 23-24 cost of the project, or the total cost of the project given projects were often more than one-year in length. The *Connecting First and Last Mile: Accessing Mobility through Transit Study* was given as an example. Another project noted was the *Southwest Corridor Transit Project*. The narrative mentioned working on the equitable development strategy as part of the project but was not reflected in how this would be incorporated and funded. Mr. Mermin noted the budget tables in each project were just for the 23-24 fiscal year. Ally Holmqvist noted in chat: Access to Transit is just for this fiscal year- we would be planning to start that in January (so just Jan-June) with the first few months being scoping and procurement. Metro would circle back on questions with Southwest Corridor.
- Lewis Lem asked if changes in the UPWP from previous years could be summarized or the changes highlighted when presented. Mr. Mermin noted that at the UPWP Consultation meeting March 6 Margi Bradway's opening statement would include this.
- Tara O'Brien noted that TriMet staff is reviewing the document and would have proposed edits and suggestions with the SW Corridor project as well as other projects. Clarification was asked on the document to reflect any federal planning funds to be spent in the upcoming fiscal year, and not just federal funds received by Metro. Mr. Mermin noted that any federal transportation funds are required to be shown. Mr. Leybold added that Federal transportation funds go to ODOT for statewide transportation activities, some of which are allocated to Region 1. Projects led and planned by ODOT for Region 1 are included in the UPWP, where federal funds are reflected.
- Chris Deffebach agreed there is more definition to be added the Southwest Corridor narrative with funding. Since Washington County was appointed a statewide public service provider from HB 17, they are looking at the expectations of transit provided services, and asking for the purpose and goals with projects (i.e., Last Mile). Is this to identify gaps in service, identify funds, or have project specifically listed in the RTP? It was suggested to coordinate efforts on planning and engagement, and not duplicate efforts from previous studies.
- Gregg Snyder noted Metro direct funding on the TV Highway Transit and Development Project was listed as \$268,000. Metro direct funding on the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project was a over a million dollars, for basically the same type project. Clarification was asked for how the Hope Grant was funding primarily the TV Highway project, and what the status was on outstanding grant funding from this source. Mr. Mermin will reach out to Kelly Betteridge on these issues.
- Ken Lobeck noted some projects are coming with earmarks soon that may affect projects listed in the UPWP. Mr. Mermin will be informed, and requirements for inclusion in the STIP and/or MTIP will be noted.
- Lem Lewis noted it's a good question about how the new planning grants from federal competitive awards and from new earmarks will affect funding planning.
- Lynda David noted Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) also publishes a Unified Planning Work Program covering Clark County in Washington State. As part of the Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area, RTC coordinates with Metro in developing the UPWP. RTC will participate in Metro's consultation meeting on March 6 and then RTC will hold a federal/state consultation meeting on RTC's UPWP on Monday, March 20th, from 10 AM to Noon.

**2023 Regional Transportation Plan: Introduce and begin discussion of draft Chapter 3 policies** (Kim Ellis, Metro) A brief overview of the Regional Transportation Plan and timeline for the 2023 RTP

updates was provided. Sections of the document under development were described, with details on the policy framework vision and goals. Presented were draft chapter 3 policies:

- New policies related to pricing, mobility and transit
- Updates to climate and motor vehicle policies related to new policies and CFEC
- Minor updates/reformatting to transportation equity, freight, design, TSMO and TDM policies
- No changes to safety, bike, pedestrian and emerging technology policies

Packet materials and the presentation included details on these items. Comments on the policies and draft Chapter 3 were requested by March 24.

Comments from the committee:

- Andrea Lightsey-Walker was happy to learn that more engagement with the process was planned. Regarding newer language, some noted said “black leaders and people of color” and “other people of color”. It was suggested to have more uniformity with this. On the transportation element regarding climate smart strategy, under policies 2 & 3, it states significantly increasing transit ridership and significantly increasing bike and walking with mode share splits. It was asked to see what our regional mode share shifts are and how these numbers are reflected.
- Bill Beamer noted he will become more familiar with the document to understand the spirit of how communities are recognized as we speak of equity. Historically marginalized has been used in the past to prioritize, but later ignored and re-prioritized for decades. It was encouraged to look at equity more holistically and go beyond the hesitancy of prioritization where engagement with government becomes hesitant or avoided.
- Indi Namkoong expressed interest in further discussions with the mobility, pricing and motor vehicle network policies. Regarding Policy 6 of the Regional Transportation Equity Policy evaluating transportation plans, policies, programs and investments was noted. It was asked what the next steps planned were following evaluations and what commitments to act on these outcomes. Ms. Ellis noted that language in that policy is where the regional congestion policy is addressed. An overview on how new capacity is required to be planned, proposed and considered as part of the evaluation.
- Jaimie Lorenzini was interested in learning more about the Regional Vehicle Network Policy. Regarding the climate smart strategy policy, with the prioritization of types of investments would our policy limit Metro from identifying other resources. Under the motor vehicle policy #9, would this restrict a jurisdiction consideration building a new road in the urban expansion area? Regarding the Regional Transportation Network policy it was suggested to include language of regionality of our transit system. Ideally, we want to have our full region with access to the full transit service mode.

Ms. Ellis noted development in urban areas involves planning transportation infrastructure to support this. Local governments are developing comprehensive plans now to be adopted in the system. Adding capacity in new equity policies is being intention with planning of infrastructure in urban reserves areas as part of the planning system. The priorities are established in each of the RTP policies and aligned with each. Consideration of new or additional priorities to address the direction of the policies can happen in response to changes in the region.

- Laurie Lebowsky-Young appreciated keeping policy 1 (Preserve and maintain the region’s motor vehicle network system) and policy 4 (Actively manage and optimize arterials according

to their planned functions) as important factors with our regional transportation system. The Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) language around transit was noted. Appreciation on the work with Transportation System Management and Operations Policies (TSMO) was noted with the coordination across our region to keep our system running efficiently.

- Karen Buehrig would like to see where the changes have come from and why they were made. Recalled that at one time there were actions associated with policies. Do they still exist, where are they and how will they be reviewed? Ms. Ellis noted the actions are part of the proposed policies and will be discussed at the workshop next week. With expected deeper dive discussion on the climate smart strategy comments on this will go the workshop.

Regarding Regional Mobility Policy #6, TPAC had recommended the importance of understanding the implications of this policy before approval, before using the performance measures, VMT, completeness and reliability with speed factors and how they all function.

In the Regional Pricing Policy #4, the term “minimize” is subjective. It was suggested to define this, noting the localized impact was not included in the policy. In the Regional Motor Vehicle Network Policy #6 we have many times had new capacity being added in the system from ODOT and others that are not necessarily in the local systems. It would be good to understand when this policy applies and how with the ODOT system.

Regarding the Regional Transit Network Policy #4 there are a lot of details, and a concern with saying “Corridors should generally be spaced at least one half-mile to one mile or more apart and serve mobility corridors with the highest travel demand.” It was suggested to emphasize the connections in the region rather than parallel corridors.

- Chris Ford noted the good work in the Regional Transportation Equity Policies and redraft of policy #7. Regarding Regional Motor Vehicle Network Policy #6 the use of pricing is realistically only going to work in a limited access facility. What OTC has directed ODOT to do regarding pricing is not the only pricing policy being discussed. It was recommended to have pricing policies that are overarching in general, with further details known later.

Regional Pricing Policies #4 “Minimize diversion impacts created by pricing programs and projects prior to implementation and throughout the life of the pricing program or project” may need further discussion. There are concerns with the toll rate setting knowing OTC sets the rates and Metro policies cannot work outside the parameters. The language in policies can be worked on.

Regarding the Motor Vehicle Network policy #9 there are concerns the changes are not aligned with how it’s written and what sections were struck out. It was noted that OAR 660-012-0830 is a transportation rule with city and county requirements and does not apply to Metro.

- Chris Deffebach noted it was hard to understand how pricing would work with each of the TSP levels and how each needed for separate studies. The Motor Vehicle Network policy #9 seems redundant with policy #6. It was suggested that our policies should say what our goals are, and drop the details on how these are achieved. On the matter of minimizing diversion in this discussion, it was noted they are subject to terms. There are certain types of trips that should

be on the interstate system, and others that shouldn't be, which cause diversion issues. Better definitions can be thought out.

Seismic safety references were not found in the policies. Support was given for development network in the Urban Growth areas. The fifth RTP goal of driving economic prosperity was not found in the policies. It was agreed that a recap of what has changed or added on the policies would be important. Prioritized investments are seen often in the policies but not clearly defined. It was suggested dropping them in the policy language.

- Eric Hesse noted that some priorities for discussion at the workshop next week were pricing, regional mobility policy, and CFEC planning, implementation, and management process. Regarding transit discussions the HCT strategy workgroup may have more to add with this discussion. Interest in learning how other pricing elements is showing up in updates or assumptions to relative projects. How will they show up in the RTP as financial assumptions? The referenced OAR 660-012-0830 has been on the table since the first round of pricing discussions. It was suggested to review and work on appropriate language in policies.
- Gregg Snyder noted the UGB expansion in Washington County with need to build roads, trails and transit. Challenges to this are in the Motor Vehicle Policy. Any policy that hinders the process of implementing a planned road arterial while looking at a pricing strategy that challenges the plan is problematic. It was suggested to think about expansion areas vs I-5 plans at the workshop. Hillsboro is trying to increase the growth of the semiconductor industry. There are good freight policies applicable to this that could encourage mobility in our corridors. It was asked where the workforce, commutes and economic growth policies were framed around employees. Ms. Ellis noted the policy goals often overlap, pointing out specific examples. As the draft for public comments is formed suggested language edits are welcome.
- Chris Ford noted the interest with more time for discussion possibly beyond the workshop next week on specific topics such as pricing and the motor vehicle policy.
- Jaimie Lorenzini suggested for the workshop draft to flag suggested changes to policies, whether adding a new process for local governments to complete as part of a process, or creating a new step. (i.e. adding a new step vs rewording a new language step).

**Call for Projects Update** (Kim Ellis, Metro) An update on the draft 2023 RTP project list for evaluation and review with next steps and engagement opportunities was presented. Revenue forecast elements with local agencies, transit agencies and ODOT was reviewed. The Call for Projects ended on Feb. 17, 2023. Each county coordinated development of a countywide project list that fit within the revenue forecast. Cities, counties and agencies work together to identify project priorities through 2045 that fit within the revenue forecast and then prioritize them into three buckets:

- **Near-term constrained priorities** = highest priority projects for 2023 to 2030 time period
- **Long-term constrained priorities** = high priority projects for the 2031 to 2045 time period
- **Long-term strategic priorities** = additional priorities that do not fit within the revenue forecast but the region agrees to work together to advance in the 2031 to 2045 time period

Moving forward a series of engagements with the public is planned. Next steps include March to May: Metro evaluates how well projects advance RTP goals (equity, climate, safety, mobility and economy) and seeks public input on draft project list. Metro reports findings to Metro Council, and technical and policy committees, including county coordinating committees. Metro staff prepare draft RTP for public review.



May 24: Letters of endorsement from governing bodies and project list refinements due.

June 15/29: JPACT/Metro Council consider input and technical findings and support releasing the draft RTP (and projects) for public review.

Summer: 45-day public comment period on draft RTP (and projects).

Comments from the committee:

- Danielle Maillard asked what type of guidelines referred to on environmental analysis in RTP project lists. Ms. Ellis noted several resources of data and analysis come from studies, with several Federal and state agency requirements. Lake McTighe added a link in chat with further information: Appendix F, 2018 RTP:  
[https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2019/03/01/RTP-Appendix\\_F\\_EnvironmentalAnalysisMitigationStrategies190301.pdf](https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2019/03/01/RTP-Appendix_F_EnvironmentalAnalysisMitigationStrategies190301.pdf)
- Chris Ford noted that ODOT forecast revenue with projects are still getting finalized, and working with Metro in this development. The tolling elements are unknown yet (revenues and rates). Working from assumptions to begin, forecast toll revenues from I-205 and the Interstate Bridge Program are being discussed. Lewis Lem asked how are toll revenues to be incorporated if toll rates are not yet determined? Is there an estimation method based upon an assumed average toll rate by facility? Mr. Ford noted we know an estimated amount is needed to plan and build and can assume a certain amount of revenue needed from the Regional Mobility Pricing Program. Beyond this adaptations, changes and updates following data from NEPA, legislative directives and reviews by OTC will allow for longer-term forecasting.
- Eric Hesse asked about the process of endorsement of projects, how language around refinement was to be presented and if new projects following the deadline would be possible to be added. Ms. Ellis noted we'd like all the projects included before presenting to policy makers. Refinement pertaining to significant language changes can be made as needed.

**Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC** (Chair Kloster) – none received

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, March 3, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	3/3/2023	3/3/2023 TPAC Agenda	030323T-01
2	2023 TPAC Work Program	2/24/2023	2023 TPAC Work Program as of 2/24/2023	030323T-02
3	Memo	2/22/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (during early to mid-February 2023)	030323T-03
4	Memo	2/24/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ted Leybold, Planning Manager and Jodie Kotrlik, Program Coordinator RE: Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2022 Obligation Report	030323T-04
5	Report	December 31, 2022	Annual Listing of Federally Obligated Projects <i>Federal fiscal year 2022</i> (October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2022)	030323T-05
6	Draft Minutes	2/3/2023	Draft minutes from February 3, 2023 TPAC meeting	030323T-06
7	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5319	N/A	Resolution 23-5319 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2021-24 MTIP TO RE-SCOPE THE OR8/CANYON RD PROJECT TO REFLECT ONLY THE BEAVERTON PEDESTRIAN ENHANCEMENT PORTION ALLOWING IT TO MEET FEDERAL DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	030323T-07
8	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5319	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5319	030323T-08
9	Staff Report to Resolution 23-5319	2/22/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: March FFY 2023 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 23-5319 Approval Request	030323T-09
10	Memo	2/22/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Draft 2032-24 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	030323T-10
11	Memo	2/24/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan – Draft Policies for TPAC Review	030323T-11
12	Attachment 1	2/24/2023	Attachment 1. TPAC Review Draft - Draft 2023 RTP Policies	030323T-12
13	Map	2/13/2023	Regional High Injury Corridors and Intersections	030323T-13

<b>Item</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
14	Map	2/13/2023	Equity Focus Areas	030323T-14
15	Map	2/13/2023	Regional Motor Vehicle Network	030323T-15
16	Map	2/13/2023	Regional Freight Network	030323T-16
17	Map	2/13/2023	Regional Bike Network	030323T-17
18	Map	2/13/2023	Regional Pedestrian Network	030323T-18
19	Map	2/13/2023	Regional Emergency Transportation Routes	030323T-19
20	Handout	December 2022	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Call for projects overview	030323T-20
21	Slide	3/3/2023	Monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	030323T-21
22	Presentation	3/3/23	March 2023 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 23-5319	030323T-22
23	Presentation	3/3/23	2023-24 Unified Planning Work Program	030323T-23
24	Presentation	3/3/23	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Draft Chapter 3 – System Policies	030323T-24
25	Presentation	3/3/23	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects Update	030323T-25