

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday June 2, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair
Allison Boyd
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Danielle Maillard
Katherine Kelly
Steve Gallup

Affiliate

Metro
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
Community member at large
The Steet Trust
Oregon Walks
City of Vancouver
Clark County

Alternates Attending

Jamie Stasny
Steve Williams
Sarah Paulus
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Gregg Snyder

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County

Members Excused

Karen Buehrig
Mike McCarthy
Lewis Lem
Ellie Gluhosky
Jasia Mosley
Indi Namkoong
Jasmine Harris
Shawn M. Donaghy
Ned Conroy
Rian Sallee

Affiliate

Clackamas County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
Port of Portland
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
Community member at large
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

An Bui
Aria (no last name)
Austin Barnes
Jeff Owen
Jonathan Maus
Mat Dolata
Sara Wright
Tia Williams
Vanessa Vissar

Affiliate

Marion County
HRD
Bike Portland
City of Hillsboro

WSP
Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Connor Ayers, Daniel Audelo, Grace Cho, Jodie Kotrlik, John Mermin, Kate Hawkins, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Molly Cooney-Mesker, Summer Blackhorse, Ted Leybold.

Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Vice Chair Leybold 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. A reminder was given to let us know if, as alternate member attending in place of a member to be placed as a panelist. 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

- Eric Hesse announced a recent Portland Bureau of Transportation grant award from the Department of Energy to help support public charging stations with regional partners.
- Chris Ford announced that ODOT Public Transportation Division was hiring for a Policy and Implementation Manager. The role works with transit funding around the state and active transportation projects. The link to apply was shared, with applications due June 14.
https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Salem--ODOT--Mill-Creek-Building/Policy-and-Implementation-Manager_REQ-128689-1
- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted from May 1, 2023 through late May 2023. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The monthly fatal crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was provided. There have been at least 17 traffic fatalities since the last months report, and 58 traffic fatalities since the year began.
- **Cascadia Corridor Ultra-High-Speed Transportation program update** (Ally Holmqvist) Since the last update on the technical and policy committee work was reported, the Washington legislative report is now being developed with the program team. It is expected to be completed in late June. Two grants have been submitted for the project work. It was noted a one-pager was included in the meeting packet illustrating the broad timeframes of activities and milestones anticipated between July 2023 and July 2024.

- **FHWA new discretionary grant program announcement** (Vice Chair Leybold) It was announced there has been notice received from FHWA for a new discretionary federal funding opportunity grant, the Public Protect Program. The purpose is to ensure transportation resiliency from natural hazards/disasters and climate change. There is a planning grant category and a capital grant category. Application deadline to apply is August 18. Metro requests for agencies interested in applying to contact us to check if projects are eligible to receive funds through the MTIP.

Jay Higgins asked if this was planned as a required regional approach. Vice Chair Leybold noted Metro has not and any conversations with regional Federal staff or congressional staff. But with most federal discretionary grants it's good to have a coordinator to reach at the regional level. Tara O'Brien thought the resilience plans were not required to apply as a regional approach. Infrastructure opportunities are included in the grant program with TriMet planning to apply. They will keep Metro contacted. Eric Hesse noted the City of Portland is also looking into this possibility. Dyami Valentine noted Washington County also is looking into the grant program opportunity.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from May 5, 2023

Minutes from TPAC May 5, 2023 were approved as written by majority vote of the committee. Abstaining: Tara O'Brien.

Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 23-5345 (Ken Lobeck, Metro) The June FFY 2023 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment was presented which contained four projects. Three are new projects being added to the MTIP. Two of the new projects originate from the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ) Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funding call. One new project originates from a discretionary grant award from FHWA's Bridge Investment Program (BIP). Adding the three projects now will enable them to initiate various required project delivery actions.

The fourth project is being canceled and removed from the MTIP and STIP. The project is a Clackamas County ODOT funded Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) project which proposed various safety upgrades along Redland Rd. However, other related project has completed several of the safety improvements in the project area. The remaining High Friction Surface Treatment (HFST) cost review determined additional costs would be required to complete the scope of work. Upon review by ODOT and Clackamas County, both provided concurrence to cancel the project. The HSIP funds will be returned to ODOT's All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) program.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 23-5345 to add the three new projects and cancel the Clackamas County HSIP funded Redland Rd project to the 2021-24 MTIP.

Moved: Gerik Kransky Seconded: Tara O'Brien

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Finalizing draft RTP and list of project and program priorities for public review (Kim Ellis, Metro) The presentation provided an update on development of the draft RTP, project list and HCT Strategy for public review. It was noted our region is growing and changing, with insufficient transportation funding to meet our needs today and in the future. Project priorities in the draft plan came from adopted local, regional and state plans in support of regional vision, goals and policies.

The RTP document under development was presented with highlights from the chapters. Community engagement and online survey results were shared. Resolution No. 23-5343 for the purpose of releasing the draft 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), project list and draft 2023 HCT Strategy for public review and policy discussion was presented. It was noted this action supports minor updates to exhibits to prepare them for public review and recognizes additional work that will continue this summer and early fall.

Comments from the committee:

- Molly Cooney-Mesker noted the draft online survey #3 summary is posted on the RTP webpage with some of the details that Kim referenced. The sections of the summary are bookmarked. Note the project-specific comments, sorted by nominating agency, are included in Appendix C of the survey summary.
https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2023/06/01/2023_0522_Metro2023RTP_survey3_summary-report_draft_V4.pdf
- Laurie Lebowsky-Young asked if the Interstate Bridge Replacement (IBR) was included in the RTP. Ms. Ellis noted it was in the project list and in project development of Chapter 8. It was also included in the financial forecast. It was asked in terms of process without full information, how will that work for future draft given to TPAC in the form of a resolution. Ms. Ellis noted following public comment period TPAC will be asked to make a recommendation to JPACT on the ordinance this fall. Asked what parts not have yet, it was noted that Chapter 5 sections haven't been completed yet but would be given to JPACT for their upcoming packet.
- Eric Hesse asked for confirmation with chapters going to JPACT in their upcoming packet. The financial information related to tolling discussions was noted and asked how this fit into the process. Ms. Ellis noted they are still gathering information on this. Appreciation for pointing out the areas where mobility policy and climate solutions are drafted. A work plan on where all the pieces are fitting together would be helpful. ODOT's letter in the packet discussing motor vehicle policy and throughway capacity was noted. Chris Ford added ODOT is having a series of conversations with Metro and more information will be brought forward.
- Jaimie Lorenzini recognized the purpose of materials to help move us closer to public comment period but suggested the full RTP draft be presented in the future beforehand. Noting Metro Council directed Metro staff direction to draft RTP scenarios with certain outcomes. How will that direction be implemented and work in this process. Ms. Ellis noted we are going back to Council to discuss expectations with the project list with high level assessments. TPAC will receive more information following direction from the Council after their June 13 meeting.

It was noted the auxiliary lane policy changes suggested by ODOT had concerns shared by

constituents, specifically addressing safety and operation issues. It was asked if ODOT could reassess these policies. Ms. Ellis noted JPACT is discussing these issues. It was clarified these are not new policies but have been in the RTP plan. Further information was provided on auxiliary lane plans written into the RTP.

- Tara O'Brien asked with understanding the next steps in the process if proposed changes in text that are flagged now and were minor, these could be sent to Ms. Ellis for consideration to incorporate. This was confirmed. Regarding the chapters not available for review it was asked what the best way to provide feedback. Ms. Ellis noted what is drafted and presented at the public comment period should receive feedback that can be considered for changes with updates to the chapters. It was confirmed the revenue forecast would be part of the recommendation to JPACT.
- Dyami Valentine noted the challenge of capturing a representative sample on surveys, but the Multnomah County respondents may not have been provided from a regional approach. For this RTP and future RTP how can we better reflect the regional input. In terms of project priorities that are reflected in the summary it was suggested to consider how these inform future conversations. Ms. Ellis noted the survey is just one tool of engagement that occurred with the RTP process regionally. The project priorities reflect who we are hearing from identified from across the region.

A suggested edit to the resolution with call to projects and the role the project lists plays around land use, TPR, locally adopted plans, as well as reasonable assumptions around these projects in terms of how they fall being constructed and eligible for federal funding was noted.

This was added to the chat: Per my comment, here's a suggested edit to better reflect and communicate the reality of how projects were picked with local input and the role they play: "WHEREAS, as part of the process, Metro issued a call for projects through which jurisdictional partners and transportation agencies were asked to identify projects that addressed regional and local needs and challenges and supported regional goals, were adopted in local Transportation System Plans or other locally adopted plans, reflected public priorities, were reasonably expected to be constructed within the timeframes established within a regionally-coordinated financially constrained revenue forecast, and provide eligibility for strategic state and federal funding opportunities."

- Laurie Lebowski-Young referred to page 381 of the meeting packet on policy 6 with adding capacity. It was suggested to define capacity. Auxiliary lanes could facilitate, for instance bus on shoulder for transit moving in and out of travel lanes, how to influence the capacity for transit and freight traffic with regional economic importance. A question was asked on new policy 6 regarding IBR and discussion on auxiliary lanes that were not yet defined and what their project timing was. Ms. Ellis noted capacity is defined in the glossary. In terms of timing with the IBR and other projects they are far along in the project development work. These are not totally definitive but recognize that new things are being added with new processes being developed and new changes identified.

At this time the committee took a short break, then resumed with the discussion.

- Steve Williams noted concern about the characterization of auxiliary lanes that appears in

the RTP draft. Noting the high percentage of freight travel in Clackamas County between local roads the arterials, truck movement challenges should be called out for auxiliary lane freight travel with the importance to economy.

- Chris Ford noted ODOT wants to ensure the RTP process is consistent with legislative direction and the decision-making process. Letters from ODOT were noted in the packet that suggested alternative language in policies. Expectations on policies with more enclosure from state requirement and direction was asked. Two possible amendments may be proposed: one with pricing and the other around auxiliary lanes. It was felt more discussion was needed on both.

The letters noted in the packet summarizes remaining requested changes from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) on the Pricing Policies, and motor vehicle and auxiliary lane policies in draft 2023 RTP update that contains new language on the Motor Vehicle Network, however, with no analysis of the possible effects of the proposed new policies to the system and the RTP goals of economy, mobility, safety, equity and climate.

- Jaimie Lorenzini asked if you could speak more to how the proposed auxiliary lane policy will impact ODOT differently than the current policy. Mr. Ford noted some of this hasn't been figured out yet in regard to transportation and CFEC rules. He was not sure what Metro is proposing which is why he'd like to discuss further. Ms. Ellis noted page 384 in the packet, *Analysis of throughway and auxiliary lanes*, that defined auxiliary lane planning consistent with the Congestion Management Process and Regional Mobility Policy.
- Sarah Iannarone noted not seeing better alignment between agencies that address the pricing issue and safety. Everyone is fighting for vehicle capacity and yet people are dying around the region on roads. During the last 6 months in the state legislature funding for safe streets and making improvements on corridors has been decreasing. There seems to be no strategy to address deadly arterials that run through our region and address safety concerns. It appears the funding for auxiliary lanes is being debated, but funding with accountability on safety where HCT and high-density affordable housing with jobs, retail and schools will be located is missing in plans to upgrade and reach safety goals.
- Gregg Snyder made 4 points of discussion on the RTP before it goes out for public review. Starting on page 183 of the packet (Appendix C – survey comments) the comments about HCT and arterial capacity in terms of infrastructure is written typically different than what is heard at Washington Co. The County views this as more completed connections to communities with roads & bridges to transit, bikes and pedestrians to transit, parks and location connections. The wording embedded in public comments differs from complete connectiveness approach.

The importance of Chapter 8 was acknowledged. The work plan for regional major projects (I-5 Bridge as an example), but lacked the enclosure of Highway 26 where economic development plans will require auxiliary lanes and capacity planning. Noting the HCT strategy discussions held around the County, elected and stakeholders have reached out to Metro on foreseen transit strategy gaps in the system. The mayors and city leaders were very clear they appear not have been heard.

The last point regarded the Mobility Policy and Motor Vehicle Policy. It was noted the importance of housing needs in the county. This RTP makes it easier for local governments

to build the infrastructure necessary to build housing, but does it make it the same system to reach goals, or make it more difficult. While the county plans for more housing it was questioned if the goals of the Mobility Policy help toward this.

- Chris Ford noted the RTP is an overview of many regional projects planned, with local TSPs and the STIP listing more specific details on projects. A brief description of ODOT's Safety and Operations program was given. This current STIP will fund roughly 75% of the budget toward ADA issues and bridges, with the remaining funds on safety. The next cycle of the STIP is expected to be 25% lower than the current cycle. Funding priorities from regions and stakeholders will be sought.

MOTION: TPAC recommend to JPACT approval of Resolution No. 23- 5343, releasing draft 2023 RTP, project list and draft HCT Strategy for public review and policy discussion.

Moved: Steve Williams

Seconded: Jaimie Lorenzini

Discussion on the motion:

- Jaimie Lorenzini asked if there was space in this motion to include comments raised at TPAC. Vice Chair Leybold noted a summary of TPAC comments were provided to JPACT in the staff report given to them for their meeting.
- Dyami Valentine re-read the proposed addition to the resolution "WHEREAS, as part of the process, Metro issued a call for projects through which jurisdictional partners and transportation agencies were asked to identify projects that addressed regional and local needs and challenges and supported regional goals, were adopted in local Transportation System Plans or other locally adopted plans, reflected public priorities, were reasonably expected to be constructed within the timeframes established within a regionally-coordinated financially constrained revenue forecast, and provide eligibility for strategic state and federal funding opportunities."

Vice Chair Leybold asked Steve Williams and Jaimie Lorenzini if they agreed to this addition to their motion. They agreed. Vice Chair Leybold asked if there were any objections to the proposed amendment to the motion.

- Bill Beamer objected to the proposed amendment due to change in language that suggested connections and alignment with community that might not be true or necessary. Favor of moving forward with the original motion was noted.

MOTION: Moved to amend the original motion with proposed addition to the resolution as previously stated.

Moved: Dyami Valentine

Seconded: Gregg Snyder

Discussion on proposed amendment:

- Tara O'Brien asked to consider how the wording is constructed differently, for instance project or program, and project funding opportunities. It was felt projects being developed that were not necessarily in the staff plan and have not been formally adopted yet are OK in leaving out at this point since they are included in the process moving forward. Ms. Ellis noted she felt the amendment was to note local projects being adopted in TSPs and local project processes.
- Eric Hesse asked to confirm the amendment included support of public priorities. It was believed this is in the original draft resolution with existing language but could be problematic for some to accept.

- Bill Beamer noted it would be presumptuous to say we are picking and choosing community priorities. If this is placed in the language it could be telling communities yes, we did this without communities weighing in on priorities. Government priorities, yes. Community priorities, no. This doesn't reflect priorities or balance of priorities with others. It's more complex than as presented.
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted the equity engagement feedback from the presentation. It was asked if consideration of a second "Whereas" in the resolution might summarize this engagement and reflect community feedback.
- Chris Ford asked for consideration of adding "if applicable" in regard to adopted local Transportation System plans or other locally adopted plans.
- Bill Beamer noted that when talking about impacts to communities it's not the impact they are looking for given the way the language and proposed projects are framed. You are attempting to create economic prosperity and equity through these projects but putting in infrastructure that makes neighborhoods attractive with out actions that address equity actions is useless. Our region's demographics are changing and communities experiencing these disparities are not thriving from plans developed now, this region will not thrive in the future. It was highly recommended to take out the language on community priorities reflected in the plans.
- Allison Boyd supported striking language discussed by Mr. Beamer (reflected public priorities, and made progress toward the draft 2023 RTP vision and goals for the future transportation system), and keep Mr. Valentine's amendment changes to the motion. The suggested funding opportunities language from Ms. O'Brien was added. The suggestion of adding "if applicable" from Mr. Ford was changed to "consistent" by Mr. Valentine.

Proposed amendment to Resolution 23-5343:

WHEREAS, as part of the process, Metro issued a call for projects through which jurisdictional partners and transportation agencies were asked to identify projects that addressed regional and local needs and challenges and supported regional goals, consistent with adopted local Transportation System Plans or other locally adopted plans, were reasonably expected to be implemented within the timeframes established within a regionally-coordinated financially constrained revenue forecast, and provide eligibility for strategic state and federal funding opportunities.

Voted:

In favor or amendment: 15 Opposed to amendment: 1, Sarah Iannarone No abstentions.

Amendment to motion passed.

MOTION: Proposed amendment to draft 2023 RTP to exclude the Motor Vehicle Policies, section 3.3 Regional Network Visions, Concepts and Policies before sending recommendation to JPACT on accepting for public review.

Moved: Chris Ford Seconded: Steve Williams

Discussion on proposed amendment:

- Gregg Snyder asked if we exclude this policy from the draft release, when would it theoretically come back to us for a second review. Allison Boyd asked if it was possible to still have further discussion on the policy if keeping it included in the draft public review. Ms. Ellis confirmed further discussions were planned on the policy before final adoption of the plan.
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted the need to highlight concerns raised in this discussion to JPACT.

MOTION (restated): Proposed amendment to draft 2023 RTP to exclude the Motor Vehicle Policies, section 3.3 Regional Network Visions, Concepts and Policies before sending recommendation to JPACT on accepting for public review.

Voted:

In favor of amendment: 4 (Chris Ford, Bill Beamer, Steve Williams, Danielle Maillard)

Opposed to amendment: 8

Abstentions: 3 (Laurie Lebowsky-Young, Judith Perez, Gregg Snyder)

Amendment to motion failed.

MOTION (original restated): TPAC recommend to JPACT approval of Resolution No. 23- 5343, releasing draft 2023 RTP, project list and draft HCT Strategy for public review and policy discussion.

With proposed amendment to Resolution 23-5343 that was approved (restated):

WHEREAS, as part of the process, Metro issued a call for projects through which jurisdictional partners and transportation agencies were asked to identify projects that addressed regional and local needs and challenges and supported regional goals, consistent with adopted local Transportation System Plans or other locally adopted plans, were reasonably expected to be implemented within the timeframes established within a regionally-coordinated financially constrained revenue forecast, and provide eligibility for strategic state and federal funding opportunities.

Voted:

In favor to approve the motion with amendment: 12

Opposed to motion with amendment: 0

Abstentions: 3 (Chris Ford, Laurie Lebowsky-Young, Judith Perez)

Motion passed.

2024-2027 Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Adoption Draft and Public Comment Report (Grace Cho, Metro) An overview of the 2024-2027 MTIP adoption draft and report back on the public comment was provided. The 2024-2027 MTIP represents an estimate of approximately \$1.3 billion dollars of investment over 130 projects. Just under half (48%) of the investment profile is represented by maintenance and preservation projects. The remaining 52% reflects capital investments (39%), planning (3%), and (8%) on system management and operations. Over \$635 million of the 2024-2027 MTIP is focused on maintenance and preservation investments. The remaining \$687 million are split between capital investments, planning, regional programs, and other transportation activities.

As part of developing and finalizing the adoption draft of the 2024-2027 MTIP, a public comment period took place. In total, the 2024-2027 MTIP public review draft received 18 public comments, which is significantly less than previous MTIP cycles. Main conclusions:

- Dissatisfaction at pace and level of investment to advance equity, safety, and climate change
- Agreement more needs to be done to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transportation.

It was noted several amendments following the adoption of the MTIP will be expected on major projects. These include:

- Rose Quarter, I-205 Tolling, Regional Mobility Pricing
- TV Highway, 82nd Avenue Transit
- Burnside Bridge

- Discretionary Grants
- Congressionally Directed Spending

In July TPAC will be asked to make a recommendation to JPACT on the 2024-27 proposed MTIP.

Comments from the committee:

- Tara O'Brien noted the schedule with OTC approval did not appear to be aligned with enclosure of the STIP. It was asked if there could be some delay in moving forward with these federal funds. Ms. Cho noted all investments in the MTIP are included in the STIP. If ODOT or other agency partners want to proceed forward with getting expedited with federal partners on projects, all our investments are reflected there. This would be part of the review at the approval process. We also have an overlapping year between the 21-24 MTIP and 24-27 MTIP, so we always have an effective MTIP in place, even if there are scheduling issues, which will not cause issues with federal funds for projects.
- Danielle Maillard asked about the accountability around the lack of survey responses and next steps as to why that was such a small number and plans on making public engagement done better. Ms. Cho noted the MTIP is developed every 3 years for a 4-year package. Engagement around the MTIP on public comments tend to be higher numbers when more higher profile projects are listed. This current MTIP doesn't have a high-profile project included.

There are a number of processes that happen along the way in the development of the MTIP, particularly on the capital investments, RFFA as an example, that goes through an allocation of federal funding process, which have their own public engagements. Metro has a mandate about holding public engagement but needs to discuss how this can be presented and make it more meaningful.

- Chris Ford acknowledged the good work Ms. Cho and staff have done drafting the MTIP. It was suggested that if TPAC was interested in motioning to approve this at the meeting now that idea could be entertained. Vice Chair Leybold cautioned against this given the agenda now running long and scheduled for next month.
- Eric Hesse noted in evaluating whether or not to extend the meeting for an action, with consideration to help us program monies faster so that they get onto the ground faster, he'd be willing to consider a motion if the committee agreed. Ms. Cho noted Metro does not have scheduled with JPACT as an action item in June, but as a discussion item as done here at TPAC. Legislative materials are required for action and will be submitted to JPACT for their July meeting. Mr. Lobeck added the approval schedule will not impact the availability of federal funds for projects, with the Fiscal Year starting October 1.
- Tara O'Brien agreed with keeping the planned schedule since no missed opportunity for missing federal funding with approval deadlines are affected.
- Gregg Snyder appreciated the comments in the attempt to keep everything we do in trying to deliver the package of programs in an efficient and quick manner.

Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC (Vice Chair Leybold) none received.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Vice Chair Leybold at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, June 2, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	6/2/2023	6/2/2023 TPAC Agenda	060223T-01
2	2023 TPAC Work Program	5/25/2023	2023 TPAC Work Program as of 5/25/2023	060223T-02
3	Memo	5/24/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (May 1, 2023 through late May 2023)	060223T-03
4	Handout	May 2023	Cascadia Ultra-High-Speed Ground Transportation: 1-Year Program Outlook	060223T-04
5	Draft Minutes	5/5/2023	Draft minutes from May 5, 2023 TPAC meeting	060223T-05
6	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5345	N/A	Resolution No. 23-5345 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING THREE NEW PROJECTS AND CANCELING ONE PROJECT TO THE 2021-24 MTIP ENABLING REQUIRED FEDERAL APPROVAL ACTIONS TO MOVE FORWARD	060223T-06
7	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5345	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5345	060223T-07
8	Staff Report to Resolution 23-5345	5/24/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Program Lead RE: June FFY 2023 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 23-5345 Approval Request	060223T-08
9	Memo	5/26/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: Resolution No. 23-5343: Release of the Draft 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Draft 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy for Public Review and Policy Discussion – RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED	060223T-09
10	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5343	N/A	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5343 FOR THE PURPOSE OF RELEASING THE DRAFT 2023 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) AND PROJECT LIST FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND POLICY DISCUSSION	060223T-10
11	Staff Report to Resolution 23-5343	May 26, 2023	STAFF REPORT IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 23-5343, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RELEASING THE DRAFT 2023 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) AND PROJECT LIST FOR PUBLIC REVIEW AND POLICY DISCUSSION	060223T-11

12	Report	May 2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Summaries of public engagement and agency consultation – Spring 2023	060223T-12
13	Exhibit A to Resolution 23- 5343 - Draft 2023 RTP	May 26, 2023	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5343 - Draft 2023 RTP	060223T-13
14	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5343	May 26, 2023	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5343 RTP Project List	060223T-14
15	Exhibit C Resolution No. 23-5343	May 2023	Exhibit C Resolution No. 23-5343 DRAFT 2023 HCT Strategy	060223T-15
16	Letter	May 3, 2023	ODOT Letter to TPAC RE: Pricing policies in draft 2023 RTP update	060223T-16
17	Letter	May 3, 2023	ODOT Letter to TPAC RE: Motor vehicle and auxiliary Lane policies in draft 2023 RTP update	060223T-17
18	Memo	5/26/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2024-2027 MTIP Adoption Draft and Public Comment Report	060223T-18
19	Slide	6/5/2023	Monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	060223T-19
20	Presentation	6/2/2023	June 2023 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 23-5345	060223T-20
21	Presentation	6/2/2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Update Resolution No. 23-5343	060223T-21
22	Presentation	6/2/2023	2024-2027 MTIP – Overview of Adoption Draft	060223T-22