

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

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

Date/time: Friday January 5, 2024 | 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 Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Danielle Maillard
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

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
Oregon Walks
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Washington Department of Ecology

Alternates Attending

Adam Fiss
Will Farley
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Sarah Iannarone
Jasia Mosley
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy
Danielle Casey

Affiliate

The Street Trust
Community member at large
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration

Guests Attending

Anthony DeSimone
Bryan Graveline
Casey Gillespie

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Cody Field	City of Tualatin
Eve Nilenders	Multnomah County
Gordon Okumu	The Street Trust
Jean Senechal Biggs	City of Beaverton
Jennifer John	Parametrix
Jonathan Maus	BikePortland
Kate Lyman	TriMet
Mara Krinke	Parametrix
Mat Dolata	City of Hillsboro
Max Nonnamaker	Multnomah County Health Department

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Bill Stein, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, Jess Zdeb, John Mermin, Ken Lobeck, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Noel Mickelberry, Ted Leybold, 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.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

- Laurie Lebowsky-Young announced a job opening with the Washington State Department of Transportation SW region for a transportation planner to do development review, commenting on current planning development applications from local jurisdictions for compliance with state transportation policies and guidelines. They would also review proposed comprehensive plan amendments from local jurisdictions. They would review for the CIPA State Environmental Policy Act, checklists on local land development applications in the state of Washington. They are looking for someone familiar with the Washington State Growth Management Act. This position is open until Jan. 19. The link was shared in chat:
<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/washington/wsdot/jobs/4327578/development-review-planner-tps3>

A recent article from the New York Times as shared about the rise of pedestrian deaths, especially at night. Their podcast featured this issue in east Portland recently.
<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/12/11/upshot/nighttime-deaths.html>

- Karen Buehrig announced that their Clackamas County Principal Planner moved onto a different position. So there is an opening which is very exciting because we'll be updating our transportation system plan, as well as have many different activities going on within the county. It was noted that Clackamas County is both urban and rural which offers opportunity for planning in unique was. We are extending the close date for the Clackamas County Principal Planner - Transportation until February 7th. The job posting link was shared in chat:
https://hrapp.clackamas.us/psc/recruit/EMPLOYEE/HRMS/c/HRS_HRAM_FL.HRS_CG_SEARCH_FL.GBL?Page=HRS_APP_SCHJOB_FL&Action=U
- Lake McTighe announced Metro has hired a Safe Streets for All assistant GIS position that's for our safety program and for implementation of our Safe Streets for All grant. It was announced Metro is also hiring for an associate safety planner position, as a limited duration. This is also to help implement

our Safe Streets for All grant. The position posting closes on Jan. 16. We're quickly assembling our safety program team with a lot of excitement for the next couple years as we get to focus much more deeply on safety, especially engagement with our partners across the region who are doing really good work on the ground. The link to the position was shared:

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/oregonmetro/jobs/4319936/associate-transportation-planner-limited-duration>

- Neelam Dorman announced ODOT has a senior transportation planner position in Region 1. A couple of responsibilities for this position would be working with local agencies as many of you are updating your transportation system plans, staffing, county coordinating meetings, and administrating the transportation growth and management grant program. A link was shared in chat: ODOT Senior Transportation Planner:

https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Portland--ODOT--Region-1-Headquarters/Senior-Transportation-Planner_REQ-145635

The Oregon Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee is looking for an at-lkarge member. This is an eight member Governor appointed statewide committee advising ODOT on statewide bicycle & pedestrian issues. The link in chat provides background on what the committee does and has a section of recruiting application deadlines: <https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Get-Involved/Pages/OBPAC.aspx>

- **2027-30 STIP update** (Neelam Dorman) I don't have a lot more to share since the November OTC meeting. A brief recap was given from the TPAC November meeting on funding allocations by program categories. The ARTS application process is moving far ahead of the STIP schedule. That submission deadline was Dec. 15. We are moving ahead with that grant program.

We aren't anticipating starting scoping until summer of this year, and that's much later than it typically is for STIP cycles. This is a reflection on the limited scoping that's being anticipated. There's time needed to develop and roll out new scoping software and processes.

A couple of changes we're doing is with a few nomenclature changes. Previously we used the percent terminology. We're simplifying that. Now the terminology will be essentially a proposed project list, and then a funded project list. We don't know anything about what the regional allocations will be of those funded categories. There's the big umber that goes into different things. We don't know how much of that will come to the region. We won't know that until May.

We also don't have a specific guidance on how STIP projects will be evaluated and selected. This includes how the leverage approach will work for Great Streets 2.0, how they'll take into account safety, climate, and equity considerations. Those are all being worked on and will be reported on moving forward. We likely won't have really integral information to share until after the May meeting so at the June TPAC meeting is where we can share more details.

Eric Hesse noted the ODOT TSP guidelines process is wrapping up. It was important to underscore some the messages heard, that I think as what comes out, and as OTC continues to do important work on the TSP updates, the analysis procedures manual will be important as we go through our own TSPs right now, as Metro staff reaches out to update timelines and sync up the process as we look ahead to the Regional Transportation Functional Plan. I wanted to encourage Metro to start integrating that into our workflows as much as we can so we're all on the same page.

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during December 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. It was noted this was preliminary data shared by ODOT and news reports, recognizing a lot of people have died on our streets, with a lot of older adults killed while walking. With moving into the Safe Streets for All programs progress may be soon seen. We'll also be talking about starting to showcase work that folks are doing within the jurisdictions so that we're tracking the numbers and tracking progress for making an impact.

Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride asked is there a way to include Clark County fatalities too. Ms. McTighe noted she has started to include those that come through PIO police media announcements and working on getting the data to help make that happen.

- **Cascadia Ultra-High-Speed Rail FRA Grant Award Update** (Ally Holmqvist) It was mentioned last month that we would hear an announcement on Federal Railroad Administration awards before the end of the year. Cascadia HSR and the companion application for Amtrak Cascades improvements both were accepted into the Corridor Identification and Development program and will receive \$500K for planning. Cascadia HSR did not receive the Federal State Partnership funding award (\$198M). No projects in the planning phase did.

However, this is a big milestone for HSR because Corridor ID is a pipeline with multiple phases with future awards. We still anticipate being able to implement the scope we planned (and are now beginning work with FRA to flesh out). It's just that we won't have all the funding in hand right now. We're planning to return to TPAC with details late spring or summer following some initial scoping conversations with FRA.

- **Environmental Protection Agency Grants updates** (Eliot Rose, Metro) Building onto previous presentations on the EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grants, which are grants for public agencies to apply for projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions over the next five years, I wanted to make the committee aware that EPA has announced a similar and parallel funding stream called the Community change grants. Like the Climate Pollution Reduction grants these are focused on near-term greenhouse gas reductions. The main difference is that they can be led by community-based organizations or coalitions of community-based organizations and public agencies.

This has stirred interest among many non-profits, community-based organizations in the region who are also seeing opportunities to reduce climate emissions and help meet the region's climate goals. There may be some community ideas looking for public agency feedback and support. The structure of this is a little bit different than the CPRG program. Applications are on a rolling timeline. The overall amounts are different, and the term of the grant is different. It's three years for the community change as opposed to five years for the CPRG program.

As we've been engaging through CPRG, we've had conversations about how this work can benefit equity, often seen as a lot to do on top of other requirements that are for the CPRG

grants. It's great these other resources are available to go directly to community groups for climate related ideas, including some of the many climate justice and climate equity ideas that we've been discussing through the CPRG program. A link was shared in chat for more information: EPA community change grants: <https://www.epa.gov/inflation-reduction-act/inflation-reduction-act-community-change-grants-program>

- **TPAC Survey Results & Discussion** (Chair Kloster) The results of the TPAC survey were reviewed. The first question was about having occasional in-person meeting at the Metro Regional Center. We had more or less a yes response on that with a quarterly frequency per year. A briefing with Catherine Ciarlo, Metro Planning & Development Director, will be held to discuss further and be reported back to the committee.

The second question was whether there was interest in Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (DEI) training which the committee has done in the past. This was a mixed result in the survey. Some noted they had this already through their employers. Some asked if it could be worked into TPAC regular meetings. A meeting with the new DEI program manager for department is planned before reporting back to the committee with further details.

The third question was about a TPAC book club which drew many curious responses. They ranged from no, not a reader, no but like the idea, other found it interesting, others asking were they pushing the agenda. It was suggested it could be an opt-in participation. Chair Kloster, VC Leybold and TPAC member Jaimie Lorenzini will meet to discuss further.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from December 1, 2023

Minutes from TPAC December 1, 2023 were approved unanimously with one abstention: Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment Resolution 24-5380

Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Ken Lobeck) The January 2024 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment bundle adds or amends a total of eight projects. A summary of project changes:

Key 23462. Beaverton School District EV Chargers project cancelation:

Upon additional review of the project DEQ with the Beaverton School District, the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has determined the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funded improvement project will not move forward and has requested ODOT cancel the project from the MTIP and STIP.

Key – NEW. Metro 82nd Ave Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Project Development planning project:

Action: The formal amendment adds the new project development project to the MTIP and STIP. The project contains Metro approved Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) federal funds (\$5 million), and \$1 million of federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG-U) funds along with the required 10.27% minimum local match.

Key 23239, Metro Carbon Reduction Program Reserve and Key 23229, Metro Transit Corridor Development split projects:

Action: Split Projects.

Carbon (\$5 million federal) and STBG funds (\$1 million federal) are split off the two PGBs and transferred to support the new 82nd Ave BRT Project Development planning project. The required 10.27% minimum local match is included.

Key 22435. ODOT - OR47/OR8/US30 Curb Ramps:

Action: Cost Increase.

The project will construct curb ramps to ADA standards to various site locations at OR47 and US30. Most of the project is located outside of the Metropolitan Planning Boundary.

Key 22185 and 23188. TriMet - Enhanced Seniors Mobility/ Individuals w/Disabilities (2024 and 2025 appropriations):

Action: Add Funds

Both projects belong to TriMet. They involve providing para-transit services to senior and to disable persons. The funding program is referred to as Section 5310.

Key 20329. West Linn - OR43: Willamette Dr at Marylhurst Drive (West Linn):

Action: Scope Change

The formal amendment revises the project scope to primarily be located at the Marylhurst Drive intersection and be limited to intersection safety improvements and an upgrades traffic signal.

Comments from the committee:

Gerik Kransky pointed out that the canceled DEQ funded project operating with the CMAC funds will actually be continuing that project through a different revenue source. The Beaverton School District was unable to meet ODOT's project delivery requirements as part of it being funded through our CMAC partnership. And so DEQ was able to find some state revenue to keep that project whole. We will still be installing some bus electrification charging infrastructure with the Beaverton School District, just not through CMAC.

Karen Buehrig asked about the funding going to the 82nd Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. It seemed there are two funding sources. Is that why there are two different numbers associated with it? And do the different numbers then fund different part of the project? Mr. Lobeck noted there's a TriMet project coming which also will have federal funds on it, but that is a separate thing coming in February. But the Metro piece is that to complete various project development activities which will go all the way through NEPA completion. Under the roadway improvement project specification estimates final design it includes a total of six million of approved federal funds. Five million were approved out of the Carbon Reduction. Metro allocated 18 million from the Carbon Reduction Program and another million are being pulled to support the project from a transit quarter development, which is a project group bucket with prior approved Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) funds supporting corridor development.

Clarifying these are prior approved already under the RFFA Step one, Ted Leybold noted that if you remember we got the one million increase in funding from the bipartisan infrastructure law passing when we were doing the RFFA process last cycle. In the middle of that we got the big bump in revenue from the new authorization bill. At that time we set aside \$2.5 million into this bucket that's described for BRT development project in the three corridors of 82nd Avenue, TV Highway and McLoughlin. That's the source. That was approved through that RFFA process. That's the source of the bucket being described. So it's a combination of the carbon reduction fund allocation that was also approved prior, and that last RFFA when we got the bump in revenue from the last

authorization bill and for that carbon reduction program project.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 24-5380 to add and amend the eight projects to the 2024-27 MTIP.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Tara O'Brien

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstention; Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride.

TriMet Forward Together 2.0 (Kate Lyman, TriMet) The presentation began noting that Forward Together 1.0 was the financially constrained plan for service growth. This Forward Together 2.0 builds on this, intentionally meant to be broader to support the goal for ridership that is called TriMet's Vision 2030. The plan will identify how to meet targets for ridership in the Regional Transportation Plan and be used as a tool to seek additional operating revenue.

The goals for transit ridership in the Regional Transportation Plan 2023 update and TriMet Vision 2030 were reviewed. Ways to improve ridership addressed in this plan include improving the frequency of service on buses and MAX, expanding the hours of service, and adding new services where they don't currently exist. Engagement with regional committees, jurisdictional staff, and the public was shown with a timeline. A list of regional transportation plans was noted that have been reviewed, with TriMet asking what other specific plans or needs for transit service should we consider with this, and how use of 12.2% regionwide transit mode share goal for this project can be accomplished.

Comments from the committee:

Karen Buehrig appreciated the work being done on the plan. I think with the Forward Together framework or even Forward Together 2.0, being able to discuss how different types of transit or transportation services are appropriate in different locations could be helpful in the conversation around providing a transit service. I say that more specifically because I know a lot of the times in the suburban areas we talk a lot about the need for shuttle service. But where does that really fall within the rubric of transit service or transportation service? I know that Metro will be starting a project about last mile service and addressing that last mile piece. So being able to understand how these two projects connect together will be really helpful in future conversations.

It's also important that the work done in Clackamas County on our transit development plan in 2020, adopted in 2021, will connect with Forward Together now. Transit services and needs have changed. So it's likely that our transit development plan doesn't capture all the needs in the area. Being able to understand these facts are just the starting point because now transit lines are expected to go in different locations at different service levels.

I don't recall seeing it in your list of plans, but in Clackamas County the importance of our connection to our rural transit providers is very strong, so they are able to connect to the TriMet service. As this is an important element of connecting our neighbors with our service providers, having it highlighted in Forward Together 2.0 in some way, either from transit centers, mobility hubs, or park & rides getting to the goals. I look forward to participating in the work. Ms. Lyman appreciated the comment about coordinating with Metro's last mile planning effort. Ally Holmqvist noted that Ms. Lyman and I were able to meet late last year and coordinate on aligning schedules for Forward Together 2.0, Connecting First/Last Mile and 2028 RTP scoping. We'd planned to follow up again around now once I reinitiated scoping.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted that Happy Valley is starting to be incredibly built out, especially on our west side of town. It's worth noting that most of Happy Valley is outside of TriMet's lift area. That makes it difficult to capture transit ridership because for people to access the services they have to use the trail system. And the further out we get, the more of a disincentive to get people onto Sunnyside Road. I would be curious to see a map of the region and look at where TriMet is planning to deploy its assets, looking at places that will be functional transit deserts, even in that scenario, and starting to look at how, if money were not an issue, how we could start planning for services in those areas to start qualifying people for lift services, even if it's a local shuttle service that can connect places like Metro's affordable housing development to other essential destinations, the places that maybe aren't quite as dense, but that shuttle could be used as a proof of concept for more robust transit going forward.

TriMet had in the past a good pedestrian access plan, identifying places where there are gaps to getting to stations. I'm curious how this is factored into this, which is more of a capital one-time investment, but it seems like it could help improve ridership. Ms. Lyman noted we would see an update of the pedestrian plan as a follow up action to Forward Together 2.0. Once we have identified the scale of service growth and the locations of service growth we can start to plan for an order to provide service in some of these key corridors we're going to need to look at for sidewalks and connectivity, and find more space at certain transit centers or maybe new transit centers. I think the capital planning follows from the service planning.

Jay Higgins asked is this LIFT like the ADA transit? Does that factor into TriMet service goals? Ms. Lorenzini answered yes - LIFT is TriMet's shared-ride service for people who are unable to use regular buses and trains due to a disability or disabling health condition.

<https://trimet.org/lift/about.htm>

Eric Hesse noted the City of Portland is excited about this work. I think it's really important since we acknowledge that we have a TSP goal for nearly twice the mode share that the region does. We acknowledge a very strong service to date and appreciate that at the regional table. The balancing act between ridership and productivity and coverage is appreciated for all these needs.

I echo Karen and Jaimie's points around these efforts which may be more focused on the ridership generation, even as we need to do in combination with the first and last mile, and maybe with the Regional Transportation Functional Plan update. I will note that around how we have transit, supportive land use and infrastructure, in order to help growing transit communities, readiness for more intensive services will be an important exercise to do some scenario work to understand that as we're refreshing that rule set, that we support the body of work that helps us all contribute the way we need to really appreciate how the different responsibilities are laid out, and how they package fits together to generate that.

I think from the City's perspective focusing on where we really can get those ridership gains, particularly given the last few years of trajectory, where we are really seeing impacts across the entire transportation system with ridership down. That's a major issue for the region to grapple with even as we focus on how we make sure that the newly developing areas are getting the services they need.

It was noted that some interaction with the tolling and pricing scenario development and understanding how that relates toward ridership generation. I think the City is also grappling with

the ways in which the regional travel demand model is both helpful and at times has limitations, particularly around mode shift. I would caution as more information comes from these processes it could potentially undervalue how much mode shift might occur when significant pricing inputs are inserted into the system. As we are working with the legislature and other important stakeholders hopefully position our information well.

Ms. Lyman noted the primary planning horizon for the way we've thought about Forward Together 2.0 is 2045. The tolling that's in the RTP for 2045 network will be our primary assumptions for this plan as well. That said, we have sort of a secondary time zone that we're looking at of 2030 in order to inform our executive directors about what might be possible to meet our own goal. We know that the Interstate Bridge Replacement won't be completed by 2030. So for the sort of secondary 2030 analysis we're just assuming the regional mobility pricing program tolling is in place and not the Interstate Bridge tolling.

Mr. Hesse noted I think I further understand there may be some scenarios with and without tolling in general, so we can do a little sensitivity test around sort of how it plays out. Is that correct? Ms. Lyman noted she thought the scenarios are going to sort of a near-term scenario which means anything that we think would be in place by 2030, which is not Interstate Bridge, not Southwest Corridor, but includes the BRT projects. And it includes the regional mobility pricing program and then the longer term look that has all those MAX projects completed as well as the tolling on the I-5 Bridge.

Mr. Hesse appreciated the information and the point of syncing with the RTP. It was acknowledged other work between ODOT and Metro in terms of the Westside Multimodal Study, also raising the potential of tolling to help manage the system on the westside. I think as we are out of an RTP cycle and have the opportunity to use the model in different ways I would encourage us to continue to think even beyond what the RTP says as we look at the scenarios of how we get there.

Mike McCarthy noted that as we're talking about how to increase mode share and try to get from that 5.4% to the 12.2% one of the most opportune times in a person's life to get them to make a behavior change, say the travel mode, is when other big changes are happening in their life. Such as buying a house. We have thousands of new house going up in the expansion areas of Washington County and all around the region, and they're getting built at densities that would support transit pretty well. But right now there is no transit service in those areas. If we want people to use transit, how do we get service to areas when these houses are developed, when these people are moving in, when they are in that phase of life, when we have the best opportunity to make a behavior change in their travel mode. It's something I hope gets addressed in the plan. Because I think it's a really important factor for all of the County and region in how we actually get service to the areas that really don't have service now or transit options.

Jay Higgins was curious about if TriMet sees this plan addressing any of the kinds of issues raised by Eric and Mike. Because there is one thing about putting much of the service out there and accepting that. Such as we just need to wait for people to realize that it's a really good idea to transit. But then, there's all this tolling out of your control. So how much is the plan looking at those things, such as what else can be done around the margins to change behaviors and make it that there's that realization period I didn't even know transit was in my area. There's programmatic ideas. Is that part of the plan? Ms. Lyman agreed that those things are important. I don't know that we have a way to really analyze the effect of those kinds of programs. So no, because we're really trying to focus this

plan on what TriMet's role is, what TriMet's responsibilities are. We do marketing for our services, but I'm not sure we have data on the return of those. Like how many riders do we get per marketing campaign. I don't know. That's not really the focus of this plan because it's not an input to a model or something we feel there's anyway for us to analyze.

Eric Hesse noted there may be opportunities to layer in elasticity-based information re: some of the programmatic efforts Jay referenced in addition to the modeled results.

https://www.caleemod.com/documents/handbook/full_handbook.pdf

Dyami Valentine gave appreciation on the work and collaboration that was held with the work that was done in Washington County around our transit vision, which we are wrapping up shortly. We appreciate the work to hold off on initiating this effort until we were wrapped up because what we've done is essentially establish what we think is going to provide a network thinking longer term to really serve our community members.

One thing that we've really identified is the need to focus on that user experience, improving travel time and reliability and safe access as being key to really encouraging ridership. I think you touched on the effort. To Jay's point, one thing I think is interesting, I was hopping on a MAX a couple days ago and a rider asked the driver what's the wifi password. I found that an encouraging factor for some users if there was wifi available on our MAX system.

One thing I didn't see listed in the reviewed plans was Washington County's transit development plan, which does focus on the regional connections, the rural connections. One question I have thinking about the TRP implications, the new TRP requirements, and the land use implications around transit priority corridors and having assurance around services, and what parking requirements there are and other land use applications that are dependent on transit service being available. I think that might be a helpful exercise to consider as we're moving through this process for the local jurisdictions to have a better understanding because we have the land use authority, so we are really reliant on what that plan is or will be. So making sure that we're having those conversations and really grappling with that through this process will be helpful.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, January 5, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	1/5/2024	1/5/2024 TPAC Agenda	010524T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	12/29/2023	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 12/29/2023	010524T-02
3	Memo	12/28/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments during December 2023	010524T-03
4	Draft Minutes	12/1/2023	Draft minutes from TPAC 12/1/2023	010524T-04
5	Resolution 24-5380	N/A	Resolution 24-5380 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING OR AMENDING EIGHT PROJECTS TO THE MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	010524T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5380	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5380	010524T-06
7	Staff Report Memo	12/28/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: January 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-5380 Approval Request	010524T-07
8	TPAC Worksheet	N/A	TPAC Worksheet: Forward Together 2.0: Project Introduction and Overview	010524T-08
9	Slide	1/5/2024	December fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	010524T-09
10	Presentation	1/5/2024	January 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-5380	010524T-10
11	Presentation	1/5/2024	Forward Together 2.0 A Long-Range Plan for TriMet Service	010524T-11