

# Meeting minutes



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) Workshop**

Date/time: Wednesday October 11, 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  
Dyami Valentine  
Judith Perez  
Eric Hesse  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Jay Higgins  
Mike McCarthy  
Tara O'Brien  
Chris Ford  
Gerik Kransky  
Sarah Iannarone  
Danielle Maillard  
Indi Namkoong  
Victor Saldanha  
Tom Armstrong  
Laura Terway  
Steve Koper  
Jessica Pelz  
Neelam Dorman  
Bret Marchant  
Mike O'Brien

## **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 & Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Community Representative, The Street Trust  
Community Representative, Oregon Walks  
Community Representative, Verde  
MTAC, Washington County Citizen  
MTAC, City of Portland  
MTAC, City of Happy Valley, Clackamas Co. other cities  
MTAC, City of Tualatin, Washington Co. other cities  
MTAC, Washington County  
MTAC, Oregon Department of Transportation  
MTAC, Greater Portland, Inc.  
MTAC, Green Infrastructure, Design & Sustainability

## **Alternates Attending**

Sarah Paulus  
Gregg Snyder  
Glen Bolen  
Jason Gibbens  
Kamran Mesbah  
Vee Paykar

## **Affiliate**

Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
MTAC, Clackamas County Citizen  
MTAC, Multnomah County Citizen

---

Faun Hosey  
Jean Senechal Biggs  
Cassera Phipps  
Jacqui Treiger

MTAC, Washington County Citizen  
MTAC, Second largest city in WA County: Beaverton  
MTAC, Clean Water Services  
MTAC, Oregon Environmental Council

**Members Excused**

Laurie Lebowsky-Young  
Lewis Lem  
Bill Beamer  
Ellie Gluhosky  
Jasia Mosley  
Jasmine Harris  
Katherine Kelly  
Steve Gallup  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Ned Conroy  
Joseph Edge  
Carol Chesarek  
Erik Olson  
Terra Wilcoxson  
Dan Dias  
Aquilla Hurd-Ravich  
Anna Slatinsky  
Greg Dirks  
Katherine Kelly  
Jamie Stasny  
Adam Barber  
Gary Albrecht  
Laura Kelly  
Manuel Contreras, Jr.  
Gery Keck  
Cindy Detchon  
Nina Carlson  
Tom Bouillion  
Cat Plein  
Brett Morgan  
Nora Apter  
Rachel Loftin  
Preston Korst  
Erik Cole  
Andrea Hamberg

**Affiliate**

Washington State Department of Transportation  
Port of Portland  
TPAC community member at large  
TPAC community member, OPAL  
TPAC community member at large  
Federal Highway Administration  
City of Vancouver  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
MTAC, Clackamas County Citizen  
MTAC, Multnomah County Citizen  
MTAC, City of Lake Oswego  
MTAC, City of Gresham  
MTAC, City of Hillsboro  
MTAC, City of Oregon City  
MTAC, City of Beaverton  
MTAC, City of Wood Village  
MTAC, City of Vancouver  
MTAC, Clackamas County  
MTAC, Multnomah County  
MTAC, Clark County  
MTAC, OR Dept. Land Conservation & Development  
MTAC, Clackamas Water Environmental Services  
MTAC, Tualatin Hills Park & Rec District  
MTAC, North Clackamas School District  
MTAC, NW Natural  
MTAC, Port of Portland  
MTAC, Forth  
MTAC, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
MTAC, Oregon Environmental Council  
MTAC, Community Partners for Affordable Housing  
MTAC, Home Builders Assn. of Metropolitan Portland  
MTAC, Schnitzer Properties, Inc.  
MTAC, Multnomah County Public Health

**Guests Attending**

Andrew Plambeck  
Ari Del Rosario

**Affiliate**

Portland Streetcar, Inc.  
Portland Bureau of Transportation

Ariadna  
Bryan Graveline  
Chris Smith  
Cody Meyer  
Dakota Meyer  
Jeff Owen  
Kelsey Lewis  
Kirsten Beale  
Mat Donata  
Max Nonnamaker  
Sara Wright  
Tess Bloom

GTT  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
No More Freeways  
OR Dept. of Land Conservation & Development  
City of Troutdale  
HDR  
SMART  
WSP  
City of Hillsboro  
Multnomah County Health Department  
City of Portland  
EPA Region 10

### **Metro Staff Attending**

Ally Holmqvist, Cindy Pederson, Eliot Rose, Eryn Kehe, Grace Cho, Grace Stainback, Isaiah Jackman, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Lakeeyscia Griffin, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matt Bihn, Molly Cooney-Mesker, Ted Leybold, Thaya Patton, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster

### **Call to Order and Introductions**

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. The link for providing 'safe space' at the meeting was shared in the chat area.

### **Comments from the Chair and Committee Members**

- Federal Aid Urban Boundary (FAUB) Review (Tom Kloster) A brief review was provided with the Federal Aid Urban Boundary, part of how the census plays out with our Federalized planning boundaries. The link to the proposed MPA boundary that Metro is considering for recommendation to the Governor with updated map and portal to share comments was given: here is the ODOT interactive map and comment portal for the federal transportation planning boundary updates that are underway in Oregon:  
<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/a7c266e96058473d9e8423c7789f66e7>
- Tara O'Brien noted that TriMet just started the 2025 service planning process with the Forward Together plan. Updates on route changes and proposed service changes could be found via the link shared: <https://trimet.org/betterbus/servicechanges-fy25proposed.htm#more>
- Neelam Dorman announced ODOT Transportation & Growth Management (TGM) projects awarded for projects in Region 1 for the 2023 cycle. The City of Forest Grove was noted for the Tualatin Valley Highway Access Management Implementation project. North Clackamas Parks and Rec District was noted for their Trails System Plan. TriMet was noted for their Park & Ride Optimization Plan. For questions and interest in the TGM program contact Glen Bolen, ODOT.

### **Public Communications on Agenda Items** - none received

**Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, September 13, 2023** (Chair Kloster) Edits or corrections were asked to be sent to Marie Miller. No edits/corrections were received. Meeting summary approved.

**2023 Regional Transportation Plan – Discussion of Key Policy Topics** (Kim Ellis, Metro) Chair Kloster provided an overview with the planned process for the committees. Metro is required to meet the Federal timeline for approving the 2023 RTP. MTAC is scheduled to act on this Oct. 18 with a recommendation to MPAC. TPAC is scheduled to act on this Nov. 3 with a recommendation to JPACT. The staff recommendations presented today on key topics are opportunities for discussion for questions, feedback and suggested edits toward making the final recommendations as their committee action. Kim Ellis noted staff recommendations responded to previous engagement and public comment on the Draft RTP and HCT Strategy.

**Key policy topic #1: Investment emphasis recommendations:** Better align the project list with RTP goals and policies

- Project list adjustments in the 2023 RTP
- Regular reports on safety investments
- Improve project list development and review process for 2028 RTP
- JPACT oversight with community and business leaders
- Improve metrics and evaluation tools
- Policy guidance for project sponsors
- Longer review and refinement period

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig suggested edits – ~~Crossed out text~~ is remove text; underlined text is new POLICY TOPIC 1 (*more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording*)
  1. ~~Ensure Accountability: Ensure project partners for the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program, I-5 Rose Quarter Project and the I-205 Toll Project are accountable to adopted commitments and desired outcomes to address safety, climate and equity priorities for each project. THIS IS COVERED UNDER PRICING POLICY ITEM.~~
  4. Improve the RTP project list development and review process in advance of the 2028 RTP:
    - a. Update Chapter 8 in the 2023 RTP to identify post-RTP work in advance of the 2028 RTP Call for Projects. Specific recommendations include:
      - ii. Recommend Metro conduct a review of the 2023 RTP project list development process in advance of the 2028 RTP update. The intended outcome of this review is an improved project assessment process that better aligns project selection with community and regional priorities. ~~This work could be informed by the review of metrics and tools described above, as well as the JPACT subcommittee described below.~~ THE JPACT SUBCOMMITTEE IS NOT NEEDED TO DISCUSS THIS ISSUE. THIS IS AN ISSUE FOR TRANSPORTATION FUNDING.
      - iii. ~~Recommend Metro create a JPACT subcommittee that guides the 2028 RTP Call for Projects solicitation and prioritization process. The subcommittee should include representation from~~

JPACT, MPAC, ODOT, TriMet, and community and business leaders. THIS IS AN ITEM FOR TRANSPORTATION FUNDING.

~~b. Post RTP adoption, recommend that all agencies align investment priorities with the updated Oregon Transportation Plan, Transportation Planning Rule and the 2023 RTP to advance for consideration in the 2027-2030 MTIP, 2027-2030 RFFA process and the 2028 RTP update. THIS IS UNACHIEVABLE SINCE THE TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLAN WILL NOT BE COMPLETED UNTIL 2025.~~

- Indi Namkoong asked for clarification with changes under item 4 around the JPACT subcommittee. It was asked if proposed work in these items move to the group that will be convening for transportation funding conversations under topic 3, a possible duplication? Ms. Buehrig noted to address the fact that within the priority there is interest in having more funding available for transit and less funding for freeways. That is a conversation for transportation funding. There needs to be money available for our transit agencies to be able to work at the issues with amounts they are getting, to allow them to set priorities for better policies with that money. To her understanding at setting the priorities with the RTP, each jurisdiction forecasts their own budget and then try to stay within that budget for saying what's in the near-term and far-term. That's the foundation of building the RTP project list. It's the structural way we've been given for sending projects and getting them listed. Ms. Namkoong asked if the changes to the Transportation Functional Plan changed the local priority process with not being finalized until 2025, then the alignment might not happen after that. Ms. Buehrig noted quicker work on the Functional Plan would have been helpful to help align with RTP goals. But jurisdictions will move forward with the process.
- Eric Hesse asked to confirm the implications of these suggestions is that the conversations JPACT subcommittee are addressed elsewhere and redundant. Ms. Buehrig agreed. Ms. Ellis noted each time we go through solicitations and call for projects JPACT and Metro Council provide policy direction which will continue into the next RTP. Whether subcommittee or oversight, part of the staff recommendation was to have more agreement on priorities, recognizing local TSPs go through a deliberate process, and as they come into a regional plan they need to support regional priorities. Each agency works within their budget forecasts. We have provided policy direction and coordination that agencies can use to leverage funding.

**Policy Topic 1 – Investment Emphasis** provided by Jaimie Lorenzini

Requested Change or Feedback (*more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording*)  
Amendment Request: Policy Topic 1 (Investment Mix), add new Metro staff recommendation:

**5. Continue to improve coordination and support for small jurisdictions.**

**i. Following adoption of the 2023 RTP, develop strategies to increase the capacity of smaller jurisdictions to compete more effectively for funding opportunities, including but not limited to RFFA.**

**ii. Prior to the 2028 RTP Call for Projects, develop strategies to reduce the staff time burden on small jurisdictions and increase their capacity to participate in the RTP development process.**

**iii. Prior to the 2028 RTP Call for Projects, consider strategies to reduce the financial and administrative burden on non-state agencies submitting projects on state or multi-jurisdictional facilities.**

*Rationale:*

*CTAC convened on September 5 to discuss the pending RTP update. Within that conversation, jurisdictions raised concern about their ability to effectively participate in the RTP process given their limited staff capacity. Moreover, when funding streams do come available, they are less likely to be competitive as they have less capacity and fewer resources to develop competitive grant applications. It is also difficult to manage and accurately budget for federal projects. Finally, there are equity concerns around jurisdictions carrying the financial burden of projects on ODOT facilities that should otherwise be maintained and funded by ODOT, as well as multijurisdictional facilities.*

*To that end, I think we could metaphorically raise all ships by growing the technical capacity of smaller agencies, like Gladstone or King City, through strategies like grant writing workshops/mentorships, building a dashboard of how-to's, longer or staged application periods, help with graphic design, etc. I would be willing to pitch in with getting something off the ground.*

#### Comments from the committee:

- Ted Leybold noted that following the adoption of the RTP we'll immediately be getting into an update to the MTIP and RFFA program direction which is what JPACT and Metro Council will provide to Metro staff in terms of what objectives they are trying to achieve in the next round of funding allocation in the RFFA process and how they want to utilize the MTIP program to help shape the overall transportation program in the short term with transportation investments in the region. Part of that process will be gathering information on how we can improve. This issue for helping smaller jurisdictions, either increase their capacity or be more effective with applications or have more of a voice with investments in the region. The next RFFA cycle starts in January and runs through spring 2024.
- Kim Ellis for a more direct statement on point iii. Local agencies submitted over \$800 million on the ODOT system. Urban arterials cross over major arterials and multiple facilities. Ms. Lorenzini noted there are also multiple owners on facilities. How do we leverage those when holding conversations on elevating investments on state facilities that we don't actually own, and how do we effectively submit projects without drawing down resources.
- Tara O'Brien asked for clarification with possible burden to Metro staff in adding strategies and coordination (referring to ii), and if Chapter 8 was the right place for this recommendation. Chair Kloster noted if this amended language is important to move us forward to help local cities with TSPs it should be there. Additional requests for Metro capacity can be discussed within Metro.
- Sarah Iannarone noted the importance of staying equity focused and making sure people who have been historically marginalized from our transportation investments are staying prioritized. Smaller jurisdictions have not always focused on equity when prioritizing projects. Support and coordination can help bring an equity focus to projects. It was questioned on the amount of money ODOT has for projects, which is always about prioritizing and where funding will go. Whether roadway or transit project it should meet the needs of the community with an equity focus lens. Language in the recommendation can help us reach our equity goals for multimodal transportation with this additional support.
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted yes, we need to upgrade these orphan highways but believe there is a place in the RTP for roads and capacity projects. It's the context in which we look at them and they can get to our equity focus goals. It was added part of the reason we ask for capacity is reaching other goals, such as regional housing.
- Jean Senechal Biggs noted the importance of definitions used, such as equity. It was thought the comments were more to do with capacity for smaller jurisdictions. The quality of the work getting project lists completed should not be diminished, while strategies to include equity in our projects can be developed.

- Jaimie Lorenzini agreed to the rewording. It was noted that if we can help smaller jurisdictions be more effective in telling the story in finding the right type of data, they can show how we are reaching our goals and priorities. It's important to look outside the region at impacts, with better grant applications and coordination that will help leverage funding in the region.

**2. Pricing policy implementation recommendations:** Ensure regional concerns are addressed in NEPA processes and in project implementation

- Ensure NEPA processes address local and regional concerns related to tolling and follow through on project partner commitments
- Apply RTP pricing policy in future JPACT and Metro Council decisions on toll projects

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Ford suggested alternative language with more time spent to discuss details.

*(more was shared on rationales and proposed changes with edits marked in blue, see recording)*

**1a.** ODOT and regional partners must agree upon and document a revenue sharing approach that directs a portion of toll and/or pricing revenues to projects that address safety and diversion impacts to local streets from tolling on ODOT facilities.

ODOT Concern: Toll revenue allocation is not within the purview of ODOT or regional partners. This is the OTC responsibility as the state tolling authority and is also subject to federal requirements.

ODOT proposed text: **As established under Oregon Revised Statute Chapter 383, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) is the state's tolling authority and decisionmaker on allocation of toll revenues. The use of toll revenues is subject to federal laws, the Oregon Constitution (Article IX, section 3a), state law, the Oregon Highway Plan, and OTC Policy. Specific allocation decisions regarding the revenues from toll projects are made by the OTC using an extensive public engagement process.**

ODOT and regional partners will work together to understand the potential revenues from the I-205 and RMPP projects, and the amount of net revenue that may be available to fund projects that address safety and diversion impacts to local streets from tolling on ODOT facilities.

**1b.** ODOT must bring the work of the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC) into the analysis, discussion and decision-making about the revenue raising potential of tolling and/or pricing.

ODOT Concern: Although toll revenue allocation is not within the purview of ODOT or its advisory committees, no specific requirements are noted in this action beyond what ODOT is already doing in its work with the EMAC, who remain highly involved in the I-205 and RMPP projects as well as with the work of STRAC and RTAC.

ODOT proposed text: ODOT must bring the work of the Equity and Mobility Advisory Committee (EMAC) into the analysis, discussion and influencing decision-making about the revenue raising potential of tolling and/or pricing consistent with EMAC's foundational statements accepted by the OTC.

**1c.** ODOT should evaluate and address diversion at the mobility corridor level as part of the NEPA projects underway, such as: i. ODOT/RMPP technical team should produce a series of flow bundle

(select link) maps that can visualize the origins and destinations of users of I-5 and I-205 for the different RMPP project options.

ODOT Concern: 1c and 1ci are duplicative of the NEPA process underway. Methodology is still in development with partners and FHWA and should not be prescribed in the RTP for a project that has not yet been evaluated. Metro and other partners have opportunity to provide input into methods, but ultimately diversion impact analysis falls within the NEPA process with FHWA as the lead agency for oversight.

Text clarified in 1ci to align with what we think Metro is requesting (instead of hundreds of maps).

ODOT proposed text: ODOT will evaluate, document and address diversion on local routes where diversion is identified as part of the ongoing NEPA analyses, consistent with Federal Requirements.  
i. ODOT/RMPP technical team should produce one set of maps for each RMPP Option based on select-link analysis that show the major routes in the region conveying vehicles to/from I-5/I-205, including identified mobility corridors.

**1e.** ODOT must utilize local data and conditions to complete an analysis of the potential for using one or more managed lanes to address congestion, raise revenues for needed expansion, and minimize diversion created by the I-205 Toll Project within the project area from OR 43 to the Stafford Road interchange.

ODOT Concern: This appears to try to link the I-205 Toll Project with evaluation of a managed lane on I-205 for the Phase 2 improvements. This could delay the I-205 Toll Project and undermine the NEPA process. Proposed text separates these projects.

ODOT proposed text: Consistent with the ongoing I-205 NEPA processes, ODOT will utilize the Metro Regional Travel Demand Model and other models that rely on state, regional and local data to evaluate tolling options for I-205.

ODOT will conduct a separate analysis to determine if a managed lane concept on I-205 between OR43 and Stafford Road is viable. This analysis will include an evaluation of using one or more managed lanes to address congestion, raise revenues for needed expansion, and minimize diversion in the project area.

**1f.** JPACT and Metro Council should clarify expectation of ODOT to prepare findings that document how the RTP pricing policies and actions, and previous ODOT commitments adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council are addressed when requesting JPACT and the Metro Council consideration of future MTIP amendments for toll projects.

ODOT Concern: Action 1F is concerning as it proposes adding a new process to a programming action that is not consistent with the existing RTP and MTIP processes. Any such process should be consistent and required for all projects, not only for ODOT pricing projects.

ODOT proposed text: Consistent with the ongoing RMPP and I-205 NEPA processes and regional and state requirements, ODOT will prepare findings that document how the projects are consistent with the clarifying commitments in the Letter of Agreement (dated April 25, 2022) between Metro and ODOT and signed by Metro Council President and the ODOT Director.

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse asked for clarification on the intent with 1b directed at reconciling language. With the Nexus list, do they all need to be in the RTP? Ms. Ellis noted the staff recommendation asks what the role of that list is and how it relates to the RTP. Some of the projects are in the RTP but many of the projects in the list that request agencies to prepare a Nexus list are based on planning that didn't account for tolling which ODOT plans for more analysis around diversion and other impacts that may be needed for mitigation. It's a gray area to help us as a region try to make it less gray.
  - Karen Buehrig suggested edits – ~~Crossed out text~~ is remove text; underlined text is new POLICY TOPIC 2 (*more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording*)
1. Update Chapter 8 to identify work needed to address local and regional concerns prior to implementation of tolling projects:

~~d. TPAC and JPACT should identify what is reconciled and not reconciled with the ODOT nexus project list and ODOT Public Transportation Strategy projects so there is a clear way to track post RTP adoption.~~

f. JPACT and Metro Council should clarify expectation of ODOT to prepare findings that document how the RTP pricing policies and actions, and previous ODOT commitments adopted by JPACT and the Metro Council are addressed when requesting JPACT and the Metro Council consideration of future MTIP amendments for toll projects.

**Add the following language to the Tolling Project description Chapter 8:**

Page 8-68

8.3.1.6: All pricing projects implemented within the Portland Metro area must align with the Pricing Policies within Chapter 3. As the I-205 Toll Project develops and future phases and cost adjustments are brought into the MTIP, reports shall be submitted outlining progress on compliance with the Pricing Policies designed to supplement the information available for MTIP review.

Page 8-70

8.3.1.7: All pricing projects implemented within the Portland Metro area must align with the Pricing Policies within Chapter 3. As the I-5 & I-205 Regional Mobility Pricing Project develops and future phases and cost adjustments are brought into the MTIP, reports shall be submitted outlining progress on compliance with the Pricing Policies designed to supplement the information available for MTIP review.

- Tara O'Brien asked for clarification on 1f that recommended ensuring what the RTP pricing policy is for MTIP amendments for any tolling projects. Is this ensuring alignment with other RTP policies part of other MTIP amendments? Ted Leybold noted for all MTIP amendments there needs to be consistency for RTP requirements. The level of analysis is not as rigorous on

smaller projects as what we instituted for major projects (generally \$100 million or more). For major projects we do more rigorous quantitative analysis on RTP consistency. This language is clarifying these prior project agreements adopted under the umbrella of the RTP and would become part of the rigorous analysis that we do on MTIP amendments.

- Mike McCarthy noted the concern with the RTP relating to tolling and how the commitment in the RTP with tolling in the region plays out with discussions on different sides of this issue. Ms. Ellis noted the policy is defining tolling and how it would be implemented in the region. It's not requiring tolling and the NEPA process looks at alternatives. At the end of the day the process will determine what the preferred version is and will include whether it includes pricing or other strategies. It does not dictate pricing implemented but the process covers benefits, impacts and tradeoffs. Different purposes are looked at for revenue raising, others for GHG reduction and other goals.

It was noted that part of the concern comes from the modeling for climate action or GHG reduction/VMT reduction. Tolling is seen to account for certain percentages or certain amount of progress with these goals. If tolling is not implemented we would then need to revise those assumptions in the next RTP. Ms. Ellis agreed. There will continue to be state level discussions about assumptions or revenues and funding. Updating the RTP to reflect changes would happen in the next RTP.

It was asked what the possibility would be if they were replacing tolling with something like usage based revenue that could be tolling but also a gas tax per mile speed, or other ideas on the table. Ms. Ellis noted that's part of the conversation that's been identified in Chapter 3. It was asked to confirm the RTP doesn't add any commitment to the region's tolling, but it says if tolling does happen here's some of the things in how it needs to work. It was noted the OTC would decide if tolling is determined, but more discussions on climate impacts, how to account for progress, revenue for funding and maintaining the system would all need further analysis.

- Chris Ford noted that MTIP amendments for large projects also included TriMet projects in scale as those to ODOT. In terms of tolling and revenue it was suggested to review the Region 1ACT meeting (<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/Pages/ACT-R1.aspx>) which provides helpful context on all revenue discussions. As we work through the language on the pricing system it was advised to be cautious with the language in terms of different pricing mechanisms and programs.

*A 5-minute break was taken in the meeting*

**3. Regional transportation funding recommendations:** Secure more funding for projects that advance regional goals

- Expand regional efforts to bring more transportation funding to the region
  - Develop annual JPACT work program for 2024
  - Participate in State level funding discussions
  - Prepare for 2025 Legislative session
  - Increase competitiveness for Federal funding opportunities
  - Research on potential new revenues
  - Secure long-term funding for transit

Per Jaimie Lorenzini: *(more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording)*  
Amendment requested to Policy Topic 3, Metro staff recommended action 1, “Expand regional efforts on transportation funding”. Request following language be added.

**e. accelerating transportation infrastructure and transit-supportive development in Urban Growth Boundary expansion areas consistent with the 2040 Growth Concept.**

*Rationale:*

*The Metro Council has placed an increasing emphasis on land readiness for areas within the Urban Growth Boundary. Some areas, however, face significant barriers to providing transportation infrastructure. Whereas this land is critical for addressing the present housing crisis, it is critical that our region work together to address and mitigate barriers to multimodal transportation infrastructure in urbanizing areas. Perhaps a meaningful first step could be incorporating more emphasis on UGB expansion areas in the following programs:*

- 8.2.2.7 Regional Travel Options (RTO) and Safe Routes to School Programs
- 8.2.2.10 Regional Transit-Oriented Development Program
- 8.2.2.11 Investment Areas Program Metro’s Investment Areas

Comments from the committee:

- Jean Senechal Biggs agreed on the challenge between the housing crisis and urban growth expansion with the infrastructure needed to be assessable and ready to take our transportation infrastructure needs with limited resources in the jurisdictions when it comes to funding sources. It’s a challenge to compete for funding when going from rural to urban with the criteria required.
- Chris Ford suggested a call for an update to the 2040 Growth Concept given the housing affordability issues and the way the economy has changed. Transportation investments are not necessarily fully aligned with land use changes. Chair Kloster suggested this could be put in the ordinance as part of the recommendation. Or part of the staff report transmittal written for both committees to move forward. Metro Council is the entity that has to figure it out. Ms. Ellis noted Part 2 to Exhibit C - see comments/recommendations 345 and 367 related to 2040 Growth Concept update. If additional language is suggested this can be made part of the recommendation.
- Indi Namkoong noted transportation costs are such a huge component of housing affordability past the sticker price of construction. It’s the second largest expense for most households and that’s driven largely by the cost of owning/using cars. If the rent goes down but your driving costs/time go up, you’re often not saving much... transit, bike/ped investments are critical tools to make growing neighborhoods truly affordable for everyone, particularly folks for whom the costs of private auto ownership are out of reach or would require substantial sacrifices elsewhere. The CNT has an interesting tool getting at this relationship <https://htaindex.cnt.org/>

Per Karen Buehrig *(more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording)*

**Policy Topic 3: Transportation Funding**

1. a. developing state and federal funding legislative priorities position supported by JPACT and the Metro Council, including the need to maintain the transportation system, invest more in transit and active transportation, address resiliency of bridges and the system, and create dedicated funding for active transportation, transit, **Great Streets** and Willamette River and other major bridges;

- Mike McCarthy asked if we could write something in there that allows us to use federal funds more efficiently. Chair Kloster noted it helps to be able to move local funds into those projects with federal funds helps move the burden onto projects making smaller projects less burdensome. Wording such as “seek funding opportunities that allow us to vocalize the RTP projects and their funding source” was suggested.
- Eric Hesse noted a concern having an allocation discussion in stipulating in Chapter 8 how we plan to use all the RTP funds without fully prioritizing projects. There are several constrained funding streams, given ODOT ties to OTC directives, prioritization from public comments and unknown funding at this point.
- Tara O’Brien advised not getting too detailed in defining all the work plan items for the subcommittee in the RTP. This discussion is mostly our response to the public comments. It was not supported to accelerate construction in the language with additional parts without further discussion on prioritization when funding known.
- Dyami Valentine suggested taking it up a level and looking at the five goals. Something not really reflected is vibrant economy and mobility. Staying at the goal level is more appropriate.

**4. Climate tools and analysis recommendations:** Improve tools to better inform policy and investment decisions that impact climate.

- Update climate analysis to reflect current fleet mix
- Continue to improve evaluation and modeling tools to assess the climate impacts of transportation investments
- Request state review of key state assumptions underlying region’s climate strategy and targets
- Take actions to support EV transition

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Ford noted ODOT recently developed the Oregon Transportation Emissions Website to show STS progress. It contains up to date information on implementing the actions in the STS and progress towards achieving the state GHG reduction goal. ODOT and DLCD are expecting to add CFFEC reporting data in 2025-26 when available. Materials from these might be included somewhere in the RTP <https://www.oregontransportationemissions.com/>

Per Karen Buehrig (*more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording*)

**Policy Topic 4: Climate Tools and Analysis**

5. Take action to support Federal and State electrification efforts: Update Chapter 8 to identify actions for improved coordination and assessing the needs and gaps ~~add creation of a electric vehicle (EV) action plan that identifies~~ in local and regional actions to advance transportation electrification in the greater Portland region a way that complements existing state and federal policies and programs.

Potential local and regional actions may include:

- setting a vision for what the electrified future looks like, describing roles and responsibilities in the private sector and at various governmental levels in helping to achieve that vision;
- identifying gaps in current private/federal/state actions that local and regional agencies can fill and identifying potential implementation actions that address identified gaps and sources of implementation funding. This could include such actions as: best practices for ensuring EV

charger availability at multi-family developments - starting with those funded by Metro via the TOD and Affordable Housing programs;

- making shared EVs available (e.g., expanding car sharing and shared e-bikes/scooters, including via both site and citywide deployments); providing access to e-bikes (e.g., providing free trials at events, funding consumer rebates);
  - preparing EV-ready code amendments to ensure that it is easy and cheap to install EVs, especially at new multifamily development;
  - partnering with businesses to increase charger availability at retail and other common opportunity-charging destinations; and
  - siting and funding a limited number of high-profile public charging demonstration projects (e.g., Electric Avenue).
- 
- Eric Hesse appreciated staff responses from public comments on these issues. The tools can show us important variables for our forecasts. A link was shared for the Oregon Modeling Users Group Oct. 26 meeting with information about recent developments in greenhouse gas analysis. Acknowledgement was given on efforts with other groups working on climate strategies to help us align in direction and guidance. More discussion sessions to share information was suggested.
  - Gerik Kransky supports more discussion sessions on the issue. DEQ staff is invested heavily in the electrical fleet planning and development and offers help on support of this with the RTP.
  - Chris Ford suggested a future TPAC/MTAC workshop focused on climate activities could be helpful.
  - Dyami Valentine suggested we have Eliot Rose discuss the Climate Pollution Reduction Grant to the future workshop.

**5. Mobility policy implementation recommendations:** Finalize the mobility policy to inform system planning needs and support local land use decisions.

- Continue shift from a sole focus on congestion to a broader multimodal approach that prioritizes access, efficiency, equity, safety, reliability, and travel options
- Complete work with local and state partners before implementation:
  - Develop approach and guidance for use of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and multimodal system completeness measures to inform land use decisions
  - Review travel speed threshold for throughways with traffic signals and use of VMT per employee measure

Per Jaimie Lorenzini (*more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording*)

Request on Policy Topic 5 (Mobility Policy Implementation), Metro staff recommended action 1.c:

The new mobility policy tools could be helpful, but it's very difficult to explain to a layperson how all the different tools will work together to improve our current practice. **Please consider simplifying information about the mobility policy and putting together a one-pager or infographic reference to help us explain the tools and their applicability to practitioners, elected, and community members.**

Amendment Requested to Policy Topic 5 (Mobility Policy Implementation), Metro staff recommended action 1.d:

d. Define future analysis needed to determine an appropriate throughway speed threshold for signaled throughways and that this work will be completed **in collaboration with affected jurisdictions and the Metro Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee** as part of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan update (2024-25) and in coordination with the update to the Oregon Highway Plan (2023-24)

Amendment Requested to Policy Topic 5 (Mobility Policy Implementation), generally:

The new mobility policy metrics could provide helpful indicators, but we should be careful when drawing conclusions from the findings, recognizing that the metrics for acceptable congestion may not reflect how people feel when using the system. **Is there a way to soften our acceptance of mobility policy measures until Metro completes the outstanding analysis?**

Per Karen Buehrig (*more was shared on rationales and proposed changes, see recording*)

#### **Policy Topic 5: Mobility Policy**

##### **Supportive of recommended Actions.**

##### **Need to add the following language to Chapter 3**

Additional language should be added to Page 3-57 that clearly states **“Since implementing the mobility performance targets and thresholds are more complex than in the past, the following description of their application is an example and will be refined further within the Regional Transportation Functional Plan update. Sections 3.2.5.2 and 3.2.5.3. will be updated after completion of the update of the Regional Transportation Plan Update”**

Refine Mobility Policy 6 to read:

Use mobility performance targets and thresholds for system planning and evaluating the impacts of plan amendments, SUCH AS ~~including~~: Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita for home-based trips, ~~VMT/Employee for commute trips to/from work~~, system completeness for all travel modes and travel speed and reliability

Ms. Ellis agreed on the first proposed edit with additional language. There were concerns with the second proposed edits to refine Mobility Policy 6 with changing “including” to “such as” since it gets away from the work that led up to measures, and it’s stepping away from moving forward. The VMT/Employee commute trips aren’t part of the targets and can be removed.

Comments from the committee:

- Gregg Snyder noted that from the City of Hillsboro they are 100% behind the proposed edits from Ms. Buehrig. In the totality of the consent agenda and the proposed comments there is a feeling we are looking at possible postponing the Mobility Policy in the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Ms. Ellis noted the Mobility Policy would be in the RTP and apply to the Functional Plan. But the local implementation is pending amendments of the draft Transportation Functional Plan, depending on how it would be implemented at the local level.

Referring to comments from the City of Beaverton, Washington County has all these growth areas as part of our urban existence and they contain all the urban housing we will have in the County including what’s in the UGB area. There are 34,000 dwelling units. We need a mobility policy that we can actually apply to bring lands in from the urban reserves and build that much needed housing. Is this policy going to help us move out of the urban reserve to the urban

transition? Will it move at the same speed or slow us down? I believe it's the metric we look at this in terms of housing.

- Mike McCarthy agreed with Ms. Lorenzini on having a score card on what kind of action does this apply to. It was suggested to have staff recommendation i. for an evaluation of the safety and diversion impacts of this policy. It was asked this before the next phase of the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. Ms. Ellis noted this was included as part of the staff recommendations but later pulled due to the fact the comments related largely to tolling. It was felt more appropriate to have this analysis as part of project evaluations.

Mr. McCarthy noted diversions happen for a lot of reason and tolling is one of them. There are many people using backroads to get around causing congestion. Ms. Ellis noted the policy flags problems with congestion trends and kicks off analysis to find solutions. Chair Kloster suggested having this a Chapter 8 work program to look at diversion, or some language suggestions for the RTP for recommendation.

- Eric Hesse noted that as we look at the totality of edits and how we can prioritize around landing the mobility policy it appears one key component is connected to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. It was agreed there is more work to be done with issues raised and how our system can do them. It was suggested to have an evaluation of the impacts by how employees generate new data with travel demand.
- Jean Senechal Biggs agreed on comments of where we are with the Mobility Policy. It was agreed we give the Transportation Functional Plan a top priority.
- Dyami Valentine also supported prioritizing the update to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan.

Chair Kloster provided ideas for members to follow up with staff on questions or suggested language proposed for motions/amendments planned. For questions or follow ups for the 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy action before the Nov. 3 TPAC meeting, the committee was encouraged to contact Ally Holmqvist. These comments would be shared with TriMet.

**2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy - Discussion** (Ally Holmqvist, Metro) This agenda item was not discussed.

**Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC** - none received

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:59 a.m.  
Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC/MTAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC/MTAC workshop meeting, October 11, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	10/11/2023	10/11/2023 TPAC/MTAC Workshop Agenda	101123T-01
2	2023 MTAC Work Program	9/22/2023	2023 MTAC Work Program as of 9/22/2023	101123T-02
3	2023 TPAC Work Program	9/29/2023	2023 TPAC Work Program as of 9/29/2023	101123T-03
4	TPAC Workshop minutes	9/13/2023	Draft minutes of TPAC Workshop meeting, 9/13/2023	101123T-04
5	Memo	10/4/2023	TO: MTAC & TPAC members and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Discussion of Key Policy Topics and Next Steps	101123T-05
6	ORDINANCE NO. 23-1496	N/A	ORDINANCE NO. 23-1496 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING THE 2018 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) TO COMPLY WITH FEDERAL AND STATE LAW AND AMENDING THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK PLAN	101123T-06
7	Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 23-1496	July 10, 2023	Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 23-1496 PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	101123T-07
8	Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/29/2023	Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Chapter 2 Regional Framework Plan	101123T-08
9	Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/29/2023	Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Key policy topics for discussion to address for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan and beyond	101123T-09
10	Attachment 1 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/29/2023	Attachment 1 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Key JPACT and Metro Council discussions and actions on ODOT projects in the greater Portland area undergoing the NEPA process	101123T-10
11	Attachment 2 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/25/2023	Attachment 2 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496 ODOT Projects Adopted in 2024-27 MTIP and 2024-27 STIP with RTP ID 12095	101123T-11
12	Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496: Part 2	9/29/2023	Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496: Part 2 2023 RTP and HCT Strategy Comments Received and Recommended Actions	101123T-12

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
13	Memo	10/4/2023	TO: TPAC and MTAC members and interested parties From: Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy Adoption: Recommendations and Legislation	101123T-13
14	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348	N/A	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2023 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY	101123T-14
15	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 23- 5348	July 10, 2023	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 23-5348 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT Strategy	101123T-15
16	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23- 5348	9/29/2023	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5348 2023 HCT Strategy Summary of Comments and Recommended Actions	101123T-16
17	Staff Report	9/27/2023	STAFF REPORT: IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348 ADOPTING THE 2023 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY	101123T-17
18	Presentation	10/11/2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Discussion	101123T-19
19	Proposed edits	10/11/2023	Proposed edits presented by Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County	101123T-19
20	Proposed edits	10/11/2023	Proposed edits presented by Jaimie Lorenzini, City of Happy Valley	101123T-20
21	Proposed edits	10/11/2023	Proposed edits presented by Chris Ford, ODOT	101123T-21