

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**

Date/time: Friday November 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
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Danielle Maillard
Jasia Mosley
Indi Namkoong
Katherine Kelly
Steve Gallup

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
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community member at large
The Steet Trust
Oregon Walks
Community member at large
Verde
City of Vancouver
Clark County

Alternates Attending

Jamie Stasny
Jessica Pelz
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Gregg Snyder
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Washington 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
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Ellie Gluhosky
Jasmine Harris
Shawn M. Donaghy
Ned Conroy

Affiliate

OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
Federal Highway Administration
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration

Guests Attending

Ariadna
 Brooke Jordan
 Bryan Graveline
 Christina Deffebach
 Cody Field
 Dakota Meyer
 Dave Roth
 Ellen Rogalin
 Heather Wills
 Jacqui Treiger
 Jean Senechal Biggs
 Jeff Owen
 Josh Channell
 Kirsten Beale
 Kirsten Pennington
 Laura Edmonds
 Laura Terway
 Mat Dolata
 Max Nonnamaker
 Misty
 Tia Williams
 Zoie Wesenberg
 One phone caller

Affiliate

GTT
 Portland Bureau of Transportation
 Portland Bureau of Transportation

 City of Tualatin
 City of Troutdale
 City of Tigard
 Clackamas County
 WSP
 Oregon Environmental Council
 City of Beaverton
 HRD
 WSP
 WSP
 KLP
 Clackamas County
 City of Happy Valley
 City of Hillsboro
 Multnomah County Health Department

 WSP
 Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Andrea Pastor, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, Jaye Cromwell, John Mermin, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krueger, Ted Leybold, Thaya Patton, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster.

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

- Laurie Lebowky-Young announced a new position opening at WSDOT Southwest Region for a transportation planning engineer that will work on design and implementation of Complete Street projects. This position has been posted online:
<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/washington/wsdot/jobs/4256328/swr-planning-engineer-transportation-engineer-4?>
- Ted Leybold announced a new position opening at Metro to help us with our transportation funding policy and forecasting work. It will also support the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) process. <https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/oregonmetro/jobs/4260263/associate-transportation-planner>. The closing date is 5 pm on Monday, 11/20/2023.

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during October 2023. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was given. The names read acknowledge the traffic deaths in the region. There were 18 traffic deaths in October in the counties, and at least 130 this year to-date. Serious crash trends will be reviewed at the upcoming TPAC workshop and MTAC meeting with strategies shared that have been underway over the last few years since the last update given.
- **Federal Aid Urban Boundary Comment Reminder** (Chair Kloster) It was announced there is a window of time right now where the federal aid urban boundary for the region is open for suggestions. This is the boundary that defines areas with the urban area that is eligible for federal urban transportation funds. Deadline to comment to ODOT is Dec. 15. The link to the comment portal was shared:
<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/a7c266e96058473d9e8423c7789f66e7>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from October 6, 2023

Minutes from TPAC October 6, 2023 were approved unanimously with one correction: Chris Ford moved to strike ~~betraying~~ for “portraying a lot of transportation projects...” to page 6.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment Resolution 23-5365

Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Ken Lobeck) Resolution 23-5365 includes 11 projects in the November FFY 2024-27 bundle:

- o Add 6 new Metro TSMO awarded projects
- o Split funding from three TSMO project grouping buckets for the new TSMO projects
- o Add Multnomah County’s new Beaver Creek Fish Passage Restoration at Troutdale Rd
- o Amending ODOT’s OR8: SE Brookwood Ave - OR217 ITS upgrade project
 - Canceling ROW phase
 - Updating limits and phase costs

The new TSMO project awards were described. Amending splitting funds from TSMO buckets to support new awarded TSMO projects was described. Final note: The new projects are being added to the MTIP as “placeholder” projects. Further administration corrections may occur through the scoping verification process.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 23-5365 to add and amend the described projects to the 2024-27 MTIP.

Moved: Jay Higgins

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstention: Jaimie Lorenzini

Ordinance 23-1496 on 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Appendices, Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Kim Ellis, Metro)

The work and efforts provided by all those involved in this project were acknowledged. At this meeting the committee was asked to recommend to JPACT their approval of Ordinance 23-1496 and Resolution 23-5348. Metro Council will take action of the final adoption of the 2023 RTP and High Capacity Transit Strategy at their Nov. 30 meeting, making the

RTP effective immediately. The action process for the meeting was reviewed. Additional staff recommendations to include in the consent items action and MPAC recommendation to include in consent items action was noted.

Consent Items (*Exhibit C – Part 2*)

Chair Kloster asked members for items they'd like to have moved off the consent bundle for further discussion before taking action on the consent items.

Eric Hesse referred to the memo in the packet from PBOT dated October 27, 2023 (pg. 349-350 in the packet) for request changes, and a second memo dated Nov. 2, 2023 with request changes to the project list. The full list of changes is summarized here:

City of Portland Requested Changes to their Project List

(as requested in memos dated 10/27/23 and 11/2/23)

Requested Change 1

- Remove Passenger Ferry Pilot (RTP Project ID 12311) from the 2023 RTP Project List
- Reallocate the Near-Term Constrained \$12M cost estimate for this project and \$1.5M in additional 2030 Project List funding capacity (previously held for potential local match on FTA grant related to the pilot) to the following projects and shift from the 2045 Project List to the 2030 Project List at the following funding Year of Expenditure funding levels:

- SW Pomona/SW 64th Ped/Bike Improvements (RTP Project ID 11825): \$5.5M
- Cross-Levee Trail (RTP Project ID 11813): \$8M

Requested Change 2

- Remove from the 2023 RTP Project List the following ITS projects that have been completed, have been rescoped and do not qualify or are no longer priorities:

- Rivergate ITS Project (RTP Project ID 10373)
- Marine Dr ITS Project (RTP Project ID 10346)
- Going St Connected/Automated Vehicle Corridor (RTP Project ID 11796)

- Reallocate the resulting total of \$18.5M in 2045 Project List funding capacity to the following projects at the following Year of Expenditure funding levels for the 2045 Project List:

- Outer Taylor's Ferry Safety Improvements, Segment 2 (RTP Project ID 11883): \$15.5M – *shifting from the Strategic Project List to 2045 Project List (YOE cost estimate is equal)*
- Increase cost estimate for Inner Milwaukie Streetscape Improvements (RTP Project ID 11818): \$3M

Requested Change 3

- Allocate \$50M of Year of Expenditure funding for Union Station, Phase 3 (RTP Project ID 11870) to 2030

Project list reflective of emergent opportunities for federal partnership on maintenance, seismic resilience and other capital improvements to bring to platforms and rails in conjunction with Amtrak Cascades Service Development Planning occurring with support from the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).

- Retain \$257M in Strategic Project List funding for additional improvements and redevelopment of the station, reflective of the differential in 2030 and 2045 Project List Year of Expenditure cost estimation.

Requested Change 4

- Add new project to Constrained list:

- **Project Name:** NE Halsey St ITS
- **RTP ID #:** New

- **Time period:** 2031-2045
- **Extent:** NE Halsey St (from NE Jonesmore to NE 148th Ave)
- **Project Description:** Install ITS infrastructure (communication network, traffic signal controllers, Next- Gen transit signal priority-ready signals, CCTV cameras and bicycle/pedestrian/motor vehicle detection system) and safe speeds signal timing improvements.

- **Cost:** \$1M

Requested Change 5

- Revise project extent, description and cost:
 - **Project Name:** Sandy Blvd ITS
 - **RTP ID #:** 10301
 - **Extent (updated):** Expand extent from NE 82nd Ave to I-205 to match what is reflected in the 2023 RTP Chapter 3 draft Figure 3-38 for Arterial Management and the 2021 TSMO Strategy, as adopted.
 - **Project Description (updated):** Install ITS infrastructure (communication network, traffic signal controllers, Next-Gen transit signal priority-ready signals, CCTV cameras and bicycle/pedestrian/motor vehicle detection system) and safe speeds signal timing improvements.
 - **Cost (updated):** We estimate this extent change would add \$1M to the project cost for additional fiber and related installations, for a new cost of \$5.5M.

MOTION: To pull out (as a bundle) Comments #465, #466, #460, #481, #482, #484, #420, #466, and #519 from Exhibit C – Part 2 and adding a new Consent item(s) comment to address the Requested Change #3 referenced in the PBOT memo of October 27, 2023 and additional changes requested to the extent and costs for the Sandy ITS project and addition of the Halsey Street ITS project requested in your (second) memo of November 2, 2023.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Sarah Iannarone

Following no further discussion on the motion, the motion was added to include:

Additional staff recommendations to include in consent items action

- **Add the following clarifying language to page 1-13 in Chapter 1,** “The updated Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) in Figure 1.5 reflects urban areas as defined by the 2020 Census and represents the Metro region recommendation to the Oregon Department of Transportation. The updated MPA will be effective upon approval of the boundary by the Governor in 2024.”
- **Add new consent item to address technical corrections** as follows, “Miscellaneous copy edits, technical corrections (including numbering of sections, tables and figures and updates to reflect final RTP analysis) and other edits to improve readability.”

And **MPAC recommendation to include in consent items action:**

Amend description for RTP Project 12099:

- **delete summary of expected safety benefits in the description for the I-205 Toll Project** because it does not account for safety impacts of tolling that will be analyzed through the ongoing NEPA process.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no opposing or abstaining.

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

1. Investment emphasis recommendations

Kim Ellis described the goals with better alignment to the project list with RTP goals and policies. It was asked if the MPAC recommendation in the packet was simply branded as such and now that MPAC has engaged, this is now largely the bulk of the Metro staff recommendations that we've been reviewing over the last month. This was confirmed.

MOTION: To approve Policy Topic 1. Investment emphasis recommendation that includes:

- Project list adjustments in the 2023 RTP, including unbundling of ODOT safety project
- Regular reports on safety investments
- Improve project list development and review process for 2028 RTP
 - Improve metrics and evaluation tools
 - Policy guidance for project sponsors
 - Longer review and refinement period
 - Improve coordination and support for smaller cities

Moved: Jaimie Lorenzini

Seconded: Eric Hesse

Discussion on the motion:

Eric Hesse thought it slightly confusing to see Appendix X listed, where I think the intent is to create a new appendix that didn't yet exist in the draft. That it was a placeholder with an appropriate numeral listing. Ms. Ellis confirmed it was to be assigned that for JPACT action.

Sarah Iannarone requested a friendly amendment (shown on screen)

Given that MTAC recommended removal of the Metro staff recommendation to create a JPACT subcommittee with business and community leaders to provide more oversight and guide the 2028 RTP Call for Projects, and

Given the Transportation Equity Policies in Chapter 3.2.2, which aim to eliminate transportation-related disparities and barriers identified by marginalized communities as priorities to address through the RTP and regional transportation planning and decision-making processes, especially the focus on racial equity, and

Given that JPACT Chair and Metro Councilor Juan Carlos Gonzalez who represented the region in the recent Oregon Transportation Plan update insisted that OTP's equity framework be expanded "to include restorative justice, thus acknowledging the obligation of the State of Oregon to account for harms to marginalized communities from past transportation decisions.

This would also include making a long-term commitment to managing the existing system in a way that rectifies past harms and reduces future burdens on these communities"

I would like to propose the following friendly amendment to

Policy Topic 1, Sec 4.1.a.i

1. 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:
 - i. Recommend Metro convene a group to review ~~of~~ Metro's existing metrics and tools for evaluating safety, climate, ~~and~~ equity, mobility and economic development impacts of transportation decisions across the RTP, MTIP, RFFA and investment area programs to ensure metrics and tools reflect

community and regional priorities and advance our ability to manage the existing system in a way that rectifies past and present harms and reduces further burdens on marginalized communities. This could lead to recommendations on new tools and/or process improvements that may be needed to better align investment priorities with RTP goals and funding opportunities.

Ms. Lorenzini was asked if this was accepted as part of her motion. She noted the language is fine, but wouldn't this fall under the equity subpoint that's three lines up? Ms. Iannarone noted our goal in including it here was acknowledging that subcommittee as we were hoping it would be functioning. The thought was making sure that this group that convenes really foregrounds this reparative justice framework in their work in the run up to 2028. Ms. Lorenzini accepted amendment to her motion.

MOTION: To approve Policy Topic 1 revised with amendment proposed by Sarah Iannarone.

ACTION: Motion carried unanimously with one abstention: Chris Ford

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

2. Pricing policy implementation recommendations

Kim Ellis noted a number of changes made since the Metro staff recommendation was released in Sept. Changes aimed at ensuring local and regional concerns related to the tolling projects and the NEPA efforts that are underway and that project partner commitments are followed through on. There have been additions to the language around the revenue sharing approach. MPAC, as part of their recommendation to Council recommended the Regional Mobility Pricing project be split into two phases. One, the preliminary engineering phase that would continue to be in the financially constrained project list in the near term. Then the construction or implementation phase would be shifted to the strategic project list, which does have implications for that project. It would mean that the project would need an amendment to the RTP to allow that project to move forward to implementation after the completion of the NEPA work.

MOTION: To approve Policy Topic 2. Pricing policy implementation recommendations to include:

- 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
- Phase Regional Mobility Pricing Project (MPAC recommendation)

Moved: Jaimie Lorenzini

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

Discussion on the motion

Karen Buehrig proposed an amendment to the motion on Policy 2, Action 2. It basically holds the space to allow JPACT to have the conversation about splitting the Regional Mobility Pricing project into the constrained list and strategic list. It was felt more information was needed to fully make a recommendation on that particular project. Additional language was proposed (underlined) to provide an introduction to the proposed change and then asking that Metro and ODOT provide more information at the Nov. 16 meeting to be able to fully inform.

Approve the MPAC recommendation with the following amendment to Policy Topic 2 – Action 2:

2. Due to the technical complexity and political nature of the issue, JPACT should discuss and consider the MPAC recommendation:

“Amend the RTP Constrained Project List to split the I-5 and I-205: Regional Mobility Pricing Project (RTP #12304) into two phases, retaining only the preliminary engineering (PE) phase in the RTP

Constrained Project List and moving the construction-related phases (RW, UR, CN and OT) to the RTP Strategic Project List.”

TPAC members expressed concern with process and precedent with the proposed amendment and recognized the volume of outstanding community concerns with the RMPP. To ensure that JPACT has appropriate information on the subject, Metro and ODOT staff should provide as much relevant information as possible about timeline, cost and process change implications for this and other related tolling projects for the Nov 16th JPACT meeting.

Jaimie Lorenzini asked if it would be correct to say that this motion is really saying that due to the absence of technical information, TPAC isn't taking a position on this particular recommendation, rather we are advancing it to JPACT for more discussion. Chair Kloster noted he heard it also has political considerations like precedent, that are really up to JPACT and Metro Council to decide. Ms. Buehrig agreed, and that JPACT should make a decision beyond just discussion about it.

Tara O'Brien noted that though I agree we want JPACT to consider this amendment on their own, I also want to make sure that we convey a sense of TPAC through this discussion and what is being recommended. Many of us have concerns about the MPAC amendment moving forward. We have gotten some information, although perhaps not complete, about the impacts to timeline, cost and process changes for the Regional Mobility Pricing project, but that I don't want to miss an opportunity for TPAC to weigh in or express concerns about MPAC making a recommendation to remove future phases of a project. Although I would support this approach and what JPACT does, we want them to weigh in on this due to the political nature.

Chair Kloster offered options to this, with additional wording to the amendment as a separate motion, or have staff convey the context of this conversation when presenting to JPACT as TPAC's struggle to a split vote.

Further discussion:

Laurie Lebowsky-Young asked questions, noting the RTP is a general policy document, and it seems this is very specific to a project. That is one concern. Secondly, as Ms. O'Brien was talking about the precedent setting nature of this proposal. I hear the proposal to forward this discussion to JPACT. My question is has JPACT gone through this process before with other projects?

Chair Kloster noted this is the first time that they have made a project specific change as part of adopting the RTP, and that's why you are hearing the comments about the precedent. It doesn't mean that it's outside their role or responsibility or authority, but it's new. MPAC as a policy body has made that recommendation, which puts TPAC in an odd spot in which to consider options that we have today.

Dyami Valentine noted we have similar concerns in terms of the precedent setting nature of this with an advisory body making the recommendation on the project list. With the proposed impact recommendation before this amendment was brought forward, we feel really does address a lot of the concerns in substance. And because we really have not had enough time to fully understand the implications of this amendment, and it's TPAC's role to advise JPACT I feel we're not comfortable with the MTAC recommendation. I appreciate Ms. Buehrig's amendment with the idea that additional information needs to be brought forward, but not having TPAC's opportunity to advise JPACT. I'm not sure how to get around that.

Chair Kloster reviewed the motion on the table to approve this with the MPAC recommendation and the amendment that is under consideration that would modify that piece of it.

Gerik Kransky appreciated everyone's diligent work on process here. My role here is pretty simple. As an air quality planner I'm trying to reduce pollution from cars and truck. And the outcome I'd like to see from today's action is a recommendation to JPACT that does not include the pricing policy; Recommended action number 2. I recognize the amendment sot of pushes JPACT to consider. And it's TPAC's role to weigh in on the policy substance. My opinion is that implementing the RMPP project will reduce the amount that people need to drive. Phasing it could complicate and slow down that effort. The state legislature directed that we take this work on in HB2017. I think this matter should be resolved in that way. I think implementing our Mobility Policy Project fully and recommending JPACT to adopt an RTP that has that would reduce air pollution from cars and trucks. Chair Kloster noted that in essence Mr. Kransky is arguing against the main motion itself as well as this amendment.

Karen Buehrig addressed that fact that in Chapter 7 and the analysis done about the system that specifically calls out and addresses tolling as an important element in our regional goals. It is very important to have a program that is designed appropriately to be able to achieve those goals. This is stated in the last 2 sentences of the chapter. This is the essence of what this amendment is getting to. Being able to understand that we are implementing a tolling program that will achieve our goals.

Up until this point we haven't been able to fully understand what that tolling program looks like and fully understand its impacts. I think the intent of the initial inclusion by MPAC was to say we want o make sure that we're getting this right, and this appears to be the best tool to be able to do it, to give us the time to be able to do the analysis with respect to NEPA, to be able to then have that engagement with the public, as well as recommendations through TPAC to bring the construction element into the RTP, as we know that it's going to be a project that achieves our goals. I wanted to clarify the reasoning for the bigger picture with this amendment.

The next thing I would say related to the precedent element is that integrating a specific tolling project/program int the regional transportation plan project list is new. This is the first time we will have that tolling program except for the I-205 project that has some specific elements in its project description. This tolling program is a program that impacts all different jurisdictions and not a single jurisdiction only. I acknowledge what others are saying about TPAC shouldn't be shirking its responsibilities. I do think being able to include language about direction TPAC may have concerns. But it may be a reasonable solution or action as they move forward.

Chair Kloster noted he heard from Ms. Lorenzini she was entertaining the idea that this could be a friendly amendment to essentially the original motion, which is to move forward with something along the lines of the MPAC action embedded in this recommendation. Ms. Buehrig can withdraw her motion and put it out there as a friendly amendment that Ms. Lorenzini can accept with a revised motion. Ms. Buehrig withdrew her amendment from the main motion since the intent was this was a friendly amendment and gives the opportunity for others to make revisions to the whole package.

Ms. Lorenzini stated she would accept the friendly amendment and would like, after the amendment language, for there to be a bullet point of these as the major concerns that TPAC identified. We recognize that there are basically major community concerns that brought us to this

point, that people don't feel they're heard or have questions about the process and whether or not prior commitments are being implemented through the proposed program. Chair Kloster asked that the last part we incorporate into how we transit this to JPACT as opposed to wordsmithing the motion. Ms. Lorenzini agreed. Chair Kloster noted the motion has been approved with added language proposed by Ms. Buehrig.

Further discussion and/or proposed amendments to the motion:

Eric Hesse noted rather than an amendment, a communication on this discussion could be provided with it as considered in conjunction with the other amendments in this policy topic, which seems very focused on ensuring accountability to previous commitments. And that sufficient information is provided to all regional partners to understand, whether this in fact ultimately aligned with the program as it's designed and developed and implemented and outcomes that we have adopted from the RTP. Chair Kloster noted as hearing this as a recommendation staff could incorporate as a compliment to amendments. This was agreed.

Chris Ford had a few comments to make and then what was hoped were minor adjustments to Ms. Lorenzini's motion. These are wording adjustments to the impact recommendations. ODOT is opposed to the MPAC recommendation as it changes one of the projects. There are two issues here, the how and the why. The how is really disappointing being it a late change. We've been working on the RTP for a year and half. It's been a revolving process, but making this changes was never discussed before. ODOT is not represented at MPAC which makes it challenging to discuss technical and policy when not on the committee.

The RTP is an overall 20-year plan, what we plan to do, not an implementing plan, not a regional functional plan, not the MTIP. It's a statement for the public for USDOT for policymakers about what we plan as a region. The question here is, are we planning to do the regional mobility pricing project or not? Are we planning to do pricing? It's a process that's still going on. So this is a policy statement. Are we planning to implement pricing? I think that's ultimately the question.

Federal CRFs are interesting to interpret. We are trying to figure out what the implication for NEPA or our current belief that a full project needs to be in an RTP in order for FHWA to issue a NEPA finding. I would have to say that the CFRs are not the easiest to read through. I'm still looking for full clarity. But certainly, this would delay the RMPP process. There would have to be an RTP amendment at the very least for it to go forward. Overall, ODOT is opposed to that change. And I'm interested to have this conversation play out about the amendment. Word changes to policy topic 2 were proposed (presented on screen):

1.a. As established under Oregon Revised Statute Chapter 383, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) is the state's tolling authority and decision-maker on allocation of toll revenues using an extensive public engagement process. 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.~~

1.a.ii. JPACT and Metro Council shall provide testimony to the OTC in support of ~~their propose~~ the collaboratively developed toll revenue sharing approach, ~~and ODOT shall present the approach to the OTC for consideration prior to January 1, 2026.~~

1.b. Revised text to: **“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. ODOT shall seek opportunities to incorporate the equity framework of the EMAC where appropriate. Due to the bi-state nature of the IBR program, the advisory committees established by ODOT for the Oregon Toll Program will not be the entities utilized for the IBR program. The IBR Program will work with the OTC and WSTC to identify the process for incorporating public, advisory group, and partner agency input around toll rate-setting and policies. ~~ODOT shall, however, seek opportunities to incorporate the equity~~

Chair Kloster asked Jaimie Lorenzini if these proposed amendments to her motion would be accepted. Ms. Lorenzini noted she would be open to including some of them. Accepted is 1.a., recognizing ODOT is going through a public engagement process. Under 1.a.ii I would not accept that on the basis that while I recognize that its uncomfortable for us to set an expectation that another agency will complete an action. I do think it’s reasonable to expect that if our region is going through investing time, energy and resources to collectively develop a revenue sharing agreement with ODOT, that we have a commitment that body of work will come before OTC before tolling is turned on, so I would not accept that as a friendly amendment.

Under 1b, as a question, I’m a little concerned that the placement of the new sentence seems to allow ODOT to cherry pick findings from EMAC to incorporate into existing pricing programs, which concerns me because I don’t want to diminish the work that EMAC has done. I’d rather see language added to that sentence about incorporating their findings where appropriate into additional projects or programs. So it recognizes that we’re taking their work and applying the findings to other bodies of work.

The reason I’m OK with the friendly amendment that Ms. Buehrig brought to the table and I’m less concerned with setting a precedent is that the RMPP through the RTP project list we’re advancing a program and that program is different from other capital projects. In addition to that we’ve already made that precedent. When we went through the eight month process to the RTP to include the I-205 pricing project in our region we went through a very substantial process of changing the description of the project, placing commitments on ODOT. So this isn’t entirely new.

I would also point out that our elected and community officials have very few tolls to meaningfully influence the process. It says a lot these groups came together and shared concern to ask for it to slow down to have continued engagement to see if they could get us to yes. I want to honor those concerns about how this amendment functionally affects the project, although there’s no proof at this point that it would delay the implementation of RMPP. I also want to recognize that the concerns are so severe that it got to the point that people are using these limited tools. I think we need to hold space for both things to be true and allow our elected officials to parse that out.

Tara O’Brien suggested additional language to improve Ms. Buehrig’s proposed friendly amendment given some of the comments today. Additional wording was added “TPAC members expressed concern regarding precedent and process implications to this amendment”. Jaimie Lorenzini suggested adding wording “recognizing the volume of outstanding community concerns with the RMPP project”. As such, the additions were accepted as part of the main motion.

MOTION: To amend the motion with the three wording changes proposed from ODOT.

Moved: Chris Ford

Seconded: Gerik Kransky

ACTION: Motion passed with nine votes in favor, two opposed, and five abstaining.

MOTION: To approve the motion as amended for Policy Topic 2, with just approved word changes, and proposed amendments from Ms. Buehrig with the language improvements from Tara O'Brien and Jaimie Lorenzini.

ACTION: Motion passed with nine votes in favor, six opposed, and 2 abstaining.

There was a 5-minute break in the meeting.

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

3. Regional transportation funding recommendations

Kim Ellis provided an overview of Policy Topic 3 that focused on:

- 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
- Research on potential new revenues
- Develop strategies to fund infrastructure in urban growth boundary expansion areas
- Secure long-term funding for transit

MOTION: To approve staff recommendations as written for Policy Topic 3.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Dyami Valentine

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. There were no opposed votes and no abstentions.

Discussion items (Exhibit C – Part 1)

4. Climate tools and analysis recommendations

An overview of Policy Topic 4 was reviewed:

- Update climate analysis to reflect current fleet mix and age
- 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

MOTION: To approve staff recommendation as written for Policy Topic 4.

Moved: Karen Buehrig

Seconded: Dyami Valentine

Discussion on the motion:

Gerik Kransky noted a point of information that the 5th recommendation here around forming a local group to dig in on vehicle electrification. I wanted everyone to be aware of the standing zero emission vehicle work group that exists among multiple state agencies, ODOT, DEQ, Department of Energy, as well as Department of Administrative Services. With others, we sit down on a fairly regular basis to think and talk through our approach on regulatory programs, incentive-based programs. There's a potential for this to be duplicative. There's no reason to prevent it from happening, but I think there's a strong incentive to coordinate pretty closely because a lot of this work is already ongoing. I wanted to mention this for folks listening today who may be taking on the

work or just considering how to have this take shape if it comes to pass.

Eric Hesse shared a link from the GO-EV webinar recently attended.

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/climate/Pages/GO-EV-Charge.aspx> It was thought information here could be applicable in this space. Some tools presented could help see where 2040 communities are and help support this recommendation as it has unearthed some significant questions around some underlying assumptions and the tools we need.

Chair Kloster called for a question on the motion:

MOTION: To approve staff recommendation as written for Policy Topic 4.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. There were no opposed votes and no abstentions.

Discussion items (*Exhibit C – Part 1*)

5. Mobility policy implementation recommendations

An overview of Policy Topic 5 was provided:

- 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 signalized throughways and use of VMT per employee measure

MOTION: To approve staff recommendation as written for Policy 5.

Moved: Indi Namkoong

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. There were no opposed votes and no abstentions.

Recommendation to JPACT on adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan, Ordinance No. 23-1496 and submit to the Metro Council for adoption, including:

- Consent items
- Discussion items
- Ordinance No. 23-1496, including its exhibits

Exhibit A – 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (and appendices)

Exhibit B – Regional Framework Plan Amendments

Exhibit C – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes (*Part 1 and Part 2*)

Exhibit D – Findings of Compliance with Statewide Goals

MOTION: Recommendation to JPACT on adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan, Ordinance No. 23-1496 with listed documents as part of the package.

Moved: Allison Boyd

Seconded: Jay Higgins

Discussion on the motion:

Chris Ford wanted to suggest to the mover on this motion the addition of including a “whereas” to the role JPACT is responsible for, since other Metro advisory committees are called out with “whereas” in the Ordinance. No specific wording was prepared but would trust Metro staff to write it correctly. Motion mover Ms. Boyd agreed to the suggested improved text to the Ordinance.

Chris Ford noted this has been a long and good process. I appreciate the great coordination of work on this from Chair Kloster and Kim Ellis. And I’m really appreciative of the conversation today around

pricing and policies. There's been a lot of expertise and views expressed. I will be voting no on this, not because we're opposed to the RTP overall, but it is simply on the basis of the recommendations still including the change with the RMPP project, some reasons that due to the precedence about the how. And then also I think it's a lack of transparency by the region. Either we'll do pricing or not. Everyone's entitled to their own opinions, but I think at the end of the day that's the important thing.

Chair Kloster called for a question on the motion:

MOTION: Recommendation to JPACT on adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan, Ordinance No. 23-1496 with listed documents as part of the package and include a new "whereas" in the Ordinance to identify JPACT's role in the process.

ACTION: Voting in favor: 13. Voting to oppose: 3 (Chris Ford, Laurie Lebowsky-Young, Judith Perez) No abstentions. Motion passed.

2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy Resolution 23-5348, Recommendation to JPACT (action item)

(Ally Holmqvist, Metro) Background and overview of the High Capacity Transit Strategy was presented. Final action on this was requested through Resolution 23-5348 that included Exhibit A – 2023 Regional High Capacity Transit Strategy and Exhibit B – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes. A brief overview of next action steps from the strategy plan was given.

MOTION: To approve and recommend to JPACT Resolution 23-5348 Exhibit A – 2023 Regional High Capacity Transit Strategy and Exhibit B – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Allison Boyd

Discussion on the motion:

Sarah Iannarone acknowledged the work given on this project. A few considerations were noted as we move into the future. One, is as we're rethinking the 2040 concept plan, how are we going to think about transit differently in the future. I think it's really critical. Some of the feedback we got through the RTP engagement is our struggle to deal with that last mile problem. And some of the ways that our community is even struggling with think like safe sidewalks to transit, and the way that we can better integrate some our complete networks and some of the work done in this RTP to inform better transit connectivity and access into the future. So I'm grateful for the way that these two processes rolled out, and look forward to even greater integration and innovation in 2028.

I also want to highlight, through the IJA, the Street Trust fought for money for the innovation mobility pilot program with the intention at least when we were fighting for that money, was to make sure that we could be piloting some of these smaller shuttles and last mile solutions. We're highly supportive of any way to come up with funding to explore new solutions for some of the struggles that you're facing as well, and some of the connectivity on the ground for community.

Karen Buehrig wanted to thank everyone who worked on this HCT strategy over the past couple of years. I know we had a representative on the committee. I agree, the overall regional transit strategy is there to address so many different elements, all the different pieces of transit, the work with Better Bus and the work with the shuttles and all these different pieces. The HCT strategy as noted, is truly about the backbone to be extended into some of our regional centers anywhere in the near future. I do think that these are areas that are experiencing longer drive times to places because they're just physically located farther out. And having those solutions to be able to have similar drive times to transit times is essential. And HCT is an important tool for that.

I think we have some concerns about the inclusion of additional corridors and the overall cost that will be, and potentially actually causing a shift from the needed transit investments to pay for more expensive HCT events/investments. I will note that I will not be voting in favor of this item, but wanted everyone to know the reasons why.

Jaimie Lorenzini thanked staff and all the work groups for their efforts on this project. It was noted she planned to vote in support of this motion, but there were a few things that needed to be flagged. The first is, if we were to look at a map of the HCT areas and the toll impact areas, there's a concerning gap where the areas that will be affected by the I-205 toll project are the areas that are all lower priority for HCT. I think that's a problem when we start thinking about how do we help communities adjust to a massive shift in the way they travel.

Leading from that place, I think we need to further refine the implementation of the HCT to create a clearer path forward for lower priority corridors to move through the process. I know we have that infographic, but that infographic doesn't necessarily create clear and objective standards for when corridors will move up in priority. I also think it would be helpful if we created a more intentional process for reviewing readiness that happens more frequently than our RTP cycles. And I'm not sure if that would be a more regular time set interval or an application process to where jurisdictions can voluntarily say, we've met all these criteria, please reconsider. But I think we need to incentivize ways to help toll affected communities achieve and realize the level of transit they need to successfully function in that environment.

Eric Hesse noted Portland's appreciation for all the work that went into this. There is a lot of need out there and not always a lot of resources. I think it's important to continue be thoughtful about applying the right tool and the right context. We recognize this is one component of an overall strategy to ensure safe access to transit, connect our centers, acknowledge the importance of land use diversity mix, distance for travel, and all those things that are important to supporting transit that make it cost effective and a productive service. As we continue to think about that development pathway that we also describe enhancements around frequent service, the transformative investments in rail, and types of effects in service. The land use strategy and 2040 Refresh integrated with transportation planning with HCT will need to make sure that those services are deployed effectively with limited resources in which to advance our goals.

Ms. Holmqvist added one piece of good news. We had a little bit of remining extra funds for HCT. We heard you on the need for more tools. So we plan to be looking at doing a TSP checklist knowing that there will be some work that is coming to coordinate. For interested agencies that want to be doing some of these actions towards supporting HCT on corridors, we are going to do a checklist, and then working as a second phase a little bit more around land use coinciding with the 2040 work later, and kind of melding that as part of the access to transit work so we can be providing more specific checklist type tools, something like we had with the mobility policy work.

Dyami Valentine thanked everyone for the great effort, big lift, and really appreciated the level of effort and detail in the HCT plan that really helps identify enabling opportunities at the local level to help elevate and grow ridership. I think that was a really helpful tool and I'm encouraged by those resources that are incorporated into this strategy. Highlighting some of the conversation heard around improving access and growing that into champion local communities and identifying opportunities to support and grow ridership and elevate these priority corridors. This is something we are focused on in Washington County with our countywide transit study, work with Ride

Connection and our shuttles out in the County. These are all elements that at the local level we see reflected in this strategy. So we appreciate that.

Mike McCarthy noted he didn't need to mention we have a lot of concerns about the farther out areas, particularly because the model didn't consider trips into and out of our cities, and not been considered the way we think they need to. But with that caveat, we are going to vote in support.

With no further discussion, Chair Kloster called the question on the motion:

MOTION: To approve and recommend to JPACT Resolution 23-5348 Exhibit A – 2023 Regional High Capacity Transit Strategy and Exhibit B – Summary of Comments and Recommended Changes.

ACTION: Motion carried with one vote opposed (Karen Buehrig) and no abstentions.

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 11:36 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

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

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	11/3/2023	11/3/2023 TPAC Agenda	110323T-01
2	2023 TPAC Work Program	10/26/2023	2023 TPAC Work Program as of 10/26/2023	110323T-02
3	Handout	N/A	Democratic Rules Cheat-Sheet: Making Decisions	110323T-03
4	Memo	10/26/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments during October 2023	110323T-04
5	Draft minutes	10/6/2023	Draft minutes from TPAC October 6, 2023 meeting	110323T-05
6	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5365	N/A	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5365 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING AND ADDING NEW FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY PLUS METRO TSMO PROGRAM AWARDS TO THE 2024-27 MTIP	110323T-06
7	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5365	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5365	110323T-07
8	Staff Report to Resolution 23-5365	10/26/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: November FFY 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 23-5365 Approval Request	110323T-08
9	Memo	10/27/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: Adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Ordinance No. 23-1496: TPAC RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED	110323T-09
10	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	110323T-10
11	Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 23-1496	7/10/2023	Exhibit A to Ordinance No. 23-1496 PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	110323T-11
12	Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 23-1496	9/29/2023	Exhibit B to Ordinance No. 23-1496 Chapter 2 Regional Framework Plan	110323T-12

13	Exhibit C (Part 1) to Ordinance No. 23-1496	N/A	Exhibit C (Part 1) to Ordinance No. 23-1496 10/25/23 MPAC Recommendation to Metro Council on Discussion Items	110323T-13
14	Attachment 1 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	N/A	Attachment 1 to Part 1 to Exhibit C to Ordinance No. 23-1496	110323T-14
15	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	110323T-15
16	Exhibit C (Part 1) to Ordinance No. 23-1496	N/A	Exhibit C (Part 1) to Ordinance No. 23-1496 10/25/23 MPAC Recommendation to Metro Council on Discussion Items	110323T-16
17	Exhibit C (Part 2) to Ordinance No. 23-1496	10/25/2023	Exhibit C (Part 2) to Ordinance No. 23-1496 MPAC Recommendation to Metro Council on Consent Items	110323T-17
18	Handout	N/A	Key Dates for Finalizing the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan and 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy for Adoption	110323T-18
19	Handout	October 2023	Engagement and outreach summary 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	110323T-19
20	Memo	10/27/2023	TO: Kim Ellis, Metro Planning Staff and 2023 RTP Project Manager From: Eric Hesse, Supervising Planner - Policy & Regional Coordination, PBOT RE: 2023 RTP Project List Changes for City of Portland	110323T-20
21	Memo	10/27/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 High Capacity Transit Strategy Adoption	110323T-21
22	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348	N/A	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2023 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY	110323T-22
23	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 23-5348	7/10/2023	Exhibit A to Resolution No. 23-5348 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT Strategy Public Review Draft	110323T-23
24	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5348	10/18/2023	Exhibit B to Resolution No. 23-5348 MPAC Recommendation on Comments Received	110323T-24

25	Staff Report to Resolution No. 23-5348	11/9/2023	STAFF REPORT: IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 23-5348 ADOPTING THE 2023 HIGH CAPACITY TRANSIT STRATEGY	110323T-25
26	Memo	11/2/2023	TO: Kim Ellis, Metro Planning Staff and 2023 RTP Project Manager From: Eric Hesse, Supervising Planner - Policy & Regional Coordination, PBOT RE: 2023 RTP Project List Changes for City of Portland	110323T-26
27	Handout	N/A	City of Portland Requested Changes to their Project List (as requested in memos dated 10/27/23 and 11/2/23)	110323T-27
28	Slide	N/A	Additional staff recommendations to include in consent items action	110323T-28
29	Amendment Proposed	11/03/2023	Amendments proposed, The Street Trust	110323T-29
30	Amendments Proposed	11/03/2023	Amendments Proposed: Clackamas County and ODOT	110323T-30
31	Slide	11/03/2023	October fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	110323T-31
32	Presentation	11/03/2023	November FFY 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 23-5365	110323T-32
33	Presentation	11/03/2023	Adoption of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan TPAC RECOMMENDATION TO JPACT REQUESTED	110323T-33
34	Presentation	11/03/2023	HCT Strategy Adoption	110323T-34