



**TRANSPORTATION POLICY ALTERNATIVES COMMITTEE**  
**June 26, 2015**  
**Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber**

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Williams  
Lynda David  
Chris Deffebach  
Don Odermott  
Judith Gray  
Karen Schilling  
Jared Franz  
Kelly Brooks  
Nick Fortey  
Adrian Esteban  
Carol Gossett  
Steve White

AFFILIATION

Metro  
Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council  
Washington County  
City of Hillsboro, representing Cities of Washington Co.  
City of Portland  
Multnomah County  
Community Representative  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Michael Williams  
Dave Nordberg  
Katherine Kelly  
Karen Buehrig  
Eric Hesse  
Susie Lahsene  
Nancy Kraushaar  
Lanny Gower  
Cora Potter

AFFILIATION

Washington State Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
City of Gresham  
Clackamas County  
TriMet  
Port of Portland  
City of Wilsonville, representing Cities of Clackamas County  
Community Representative  
Community Representative

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Chris Strong  
Gary Schmidt  
Alan Lehto  
Phil Healy

AFFILIATION

City of Gresham, representing Cities of Multnomah County  
Clackamas County  
TriMet  
Port of Portland

STAFF: Laura Dawson-Bodner, Grace Cho, Dan Kaempff, Ted Leybold, Malu Wilkinson, Tom Kloster, Richard Walker, Juan Carlos Ocana-Chú, Chris Myers, Caleb Winter.

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM**

Chair John Williams declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

## **2. COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Chair Williams noted that Ms. Karen Schilling has served on TPAC since 1997. He complimented her on her many contributions, and expressed appreciation for her expertise and skillful use of consensus in decision-making. He thanked her for her service.

Member comments included:

- Ms. Chris Deffebach who worked with Ms. Schilling since 1997, recalled the Sellwood Bridge Project, noting her good judgment and wisdom.
- Ms. Judith Grey thanked Ms. Schilling for making her feel welcome and sharing resources. She requested that Ms. Schilling consider becoming a member of City of Portland Advisory committees.
- Mr. Alan Lehto thanked her for many constructive ideas and for acting as great resource throughout her tenure.
- Mr. Ted Leybold gave appreciation for her presence for solid guidance on recommendations, saying she is one of the core people for good recommendations.
- Ms. Elissa Gertler, who worked with Ms. Schilling at Clackamas County, noted her voice of reason and thanked her for her guidance in the transportation planning world.
- Mr. Phil Healy noted her common sense approach and ability to explain issues.
- Mr. Tom Kloster said Ms. Schilling was part of the team who created the 2040 Growth Concept in the 1990's and was an early advocate for bicycle and pedestrian planning as part of the regional system. She was a strong advocate during the development of the 2000 RTP.
- Mr. Gary Schmidt noted that she was an excellent collaborator. He appreciated her technical and strategic brilliance, and her wonderful sense of humor.
- Mr. Nick Fortey noted his appreciation, saying Ms. Schilling was a mentor with great knowledge of transportation planning. Her willingness throughout her tenure to ask tough probing questions has been a great service to the committee.
- Ms. Schilling thanked the committee, noting that she has enjoyed working with TPAC and that she's found her work on the committee to be very rewarding. She expressed appreciation for other committee members and said she was pleased to have contributed to this committee, which strives to be on the leading edge of planning with the goal of ensuring progress in region.

TPAC members shared the following updates:

- Ms. Judith Grey noted the passing of the Supreme Court decision on same sex marriage, saying she is happy to report that her marriage is now recognized in 50 states.

## **3. CITIZEN COMMUNICATIONS ON AGENDA ITEMS.**

There were no citizen communications.

## **4. CONSIDERATION OF THE TPAC MINUTES FOR MAY 29, 2015**

MOTION: Ms. Karen Schilling moved and Mr. Gary Schmidt seconded the motion to adopt the TPAC minutes from May 29, 2015.

ACTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

## **5. 2015-16 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) AMENDMENT**

Mr. Chris Myers and Mr. Caleb Winter (Metro) provided an overview of the amendment to add the I-84 multi-modal integrated corridor management project to the 2015-16 UPWP, and requested TPAC recommend that the amendment go to JPACT for approval. Mr. Winter discussed the resolution and the change in project budget which requires a legislative amendment as the amount of new funds

exceeds \$200,000. Per federal requirements, all transportation planning projects that are federally funded are required to be included in the UPWP.

US DOT's Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Joint Program Office (JPO) awarded Metro and agency partners an Integrated Corridor Management Deployment Planning Grant for \$191,680 plus an additional \$47,920 in local matching funds for a total of \$239,600. Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) grant combine numerous information technologies and real-time travel information from highway, rail, transit and bike operations. This work aligns with the Regional TSMO Plan, supporting the vision to "collaboratively and proactively manage [the region's] multimodal transportation system." The ICM study furthers the goals and objectives of the TSMO plan including reliability for travelers and goods movement; transportation safety and security; environment and quality of life; and, providing comprehensive multimodal traveler information to people and business.

MOTION: Mr. Alan Lehto moved and Ms. Carol Gossett seconded the motion to approve and recommend to JPACT an amendment to add the I-84 multi-modal integrated corridor management project to the 2015 UPWP.

ACTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

## **6. DATA FUNDING FOR BEHAVIOR-BASED FREIGHT MODEL**

Mr. Leybold provided TPAC members with an overview of the data funding request. He noted that they are seeking TPAC's recommendation to amend the 2015-2018 MTIP to fund data collection to support the continued development of the freight demand model. The Freight Demand Modeling and Data Improvement Project was approved by Metro Council for the UPWP in December 2014. At the time of approval, the project narrative described two funding sources, the initial \$350,000 SHRP2 C20 Freight Modeling Implementation Assistance grant to fund model development, and an undetermined allocation of Regional Freight Analysis and Project Development funds for freight data to support model estimation, calibration, and validation. The data allocation was to be within the range of \$250,000 to \$450,000, with final amount to be determined following completion of initial project tasks to develop a Model Implementation Plan and a Data Plan.

The project was initiated in March of this year. The draft data plan is complete. An initial \$100,000 in STP funds was transferred through an administrative MTIP amendment so that early data needs could be met and the project could proceed on schedule. After reviewing data funding options prepared by the contractor, Metro staff recommends a total funding of \$350,000, including the \$100,000 already allocated. These federal funds will be matched by a donation of \$40,059 in in-kind Metro services to develop freight networks and zones, land use and demographic data, and other input data.

Mr. Richard Walker provided additional detail about funding options for the behavior-based freight model currently under development at Metro. He noted that this data will meet an essential need. Once the tool is built, it will add great value to this region, providing much needed freight modeling to allow accurate decision making throughout the region.

Member comments included:

- Ms. Chris Deffebach commended Mr. Walker and his team for working on freight model, noting that getting good data can be a challenge. She asked what is not getting funded. Mr. Leybold referred to the memo included in the members' packets and clarified that in 2014-15 cycle of \$500,000 allocation had identified \$400,000 for a freight passenger rail study and \$100,000 for over-dimensional truck routes study. Another \$500,000 was allocated to support regional freight planning activities in the 2016-18 funding cycle, with the scope to be determined. There is \$1 million total from those funding sources to support regional freight planning activities. He noted that the over-dimensional truck route study is proceeding. Through UPWP and TIP amendments, the scope has been adjusted to more accurately reflect needs and funding increased to a total of

\$125,000. He noted that Tim Collins (Metro) has been shepherding the process for these studies. Due to consensus among regional representatives, it was suggested that the scope of the regional freight and passenger rail study should be somewhat decreased to accurately reflect need, and that the timing of the study would be most appropriate after the truck study is completed. A placeholder of \$200,000 of the original \$400,000 will be retained. He noted that the \$350,000 for the freight model data development will come out of the remainder of those funds.

- Ms. Carol Gossett asked about methods used to collect the information. Mr. Walker provided additional detail, noting that the study would include data collection from distributors and logistics firms. In addition, the study may include the introduction of a phone application for drivers similar to successful studies that have been performed in Florida and Chicago. The app will gather information on what trucks carry, vehicle routing, and time required, in addition to other data. He clarified that the study would address business districts.
- Mr. Phil Healy noted that the Port of Portland supports this project, saying there is a great need for this information.
- Mr. Nick Fortey said the FHA adds their support. He said that Mr. Walker under spoke Metro's efforts and that very few states or regions have undertaken this type of study. From a national perspective, he appreciates the Metro's work on this project and believes that this data collection effort is on the cutting edge of similar efforts around the country. By getting a good understanding of what is going on locally, it will be possible to take the information and analytical capacity and apply it elsewhere.

MOTION: Ms. Karen Schilling moved and Mr. Don Odermott seconded the motion to approve and recommend to JPACT an amendment to the 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) to allocate \$250,000 of existing regional freight analysis and project development funds to the freight demand modeling and improvement project.

ACTION: With all in favor, the motion passed.

## **7. MTIP AND RFFA POLICY UPDATE – WORK TO DATE - INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

Mr. Dan Kaempff and Ms. Grace Cho provided an update on the 2018-2021 Metropolitan Improvement Program (MTIP) and the 2019-2021 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) policy development and next steps leading to public comment.

Ms. Cho explained that they held workshops with local partners, stakeholders, advocates, and Metro Council to gain feedback on two areas: (1) how to shape policy to better coordinate across funding allocation processes and (2) how to best to invest RFFA funds to better implement regional policies. Based on feedback gathered in those workshops, Metro staff will present a proposal for the MTIP and a set of policy options for the Regional Flexible Funds. During the final workshop to be held immediately following the meeting, it is the hope that participants will arrive at a general consensus so that draft policies would be ready for release for public comment.

She then explained the MTIP policy proposal options, organized into three main topic areas:

- Continuation of existing coordination policies already in practice
- Refinements to the existing practices and new policies and coordination activities
- Coordination on applications for competitive state and federal funding

Mr. Kaempff detailed the four draft policy options for the RFFA workshop developed through the workshops and other coordinating committees and feedback opportunities. He noted that the goal of the workshop immediately following TPAC would be to generally approve of the draft options in order to release for public comment. Those are:

- Maintain existing RFFA policy with minor updates to reflect newly adopted regional transportation policies since the last MTIP/RFFA policy update
- Refocus the funding policy and project selection criteria to ensure it reflects climate smart strategies
- Refocus policy and criteria to support to safe routes to school outcomes
- Maintain existing Step 2 project categories as the eligible project types but eliminate the Step 2 project category splits.

Mr. Kaempff also clarified the project selection process. He said that sub-regional allocation targets will be eliminated. He said Metro staff understands that concerns have been expressed about how funds are distributed and that there is a desire for equity and fairness around the region. Federal policy dictates that funds cannot be sub-allocated. The objective in reshaping the allocation process is to partner with members and interested parties to ensure that the policy is fair and accurately reflects federal law and finds the best way to select projects from throughout the region. During the afternoon's workshop, participants will be asked to focus on policy options and to ensure they are ready for public comment, rather than on the mechanics of the selection process. Mr. Kaempff noted that there would be opportunity for additional ideas to be generated during the public comment period and that a description of the allocation process would not be finalized until the release of the project solicitation packet in 2016.

Ms. Cho added that if there is general consensus that the RFFA is ready for public comment, staff will plan to discuss options with JPACT at their July 9 meeting. The public comment period would likely run for 45 days, from mid-July to the end of August. Staff will bring public comments and feedback back to TPAC and JPACT in the fall. Council action is scheduled for December. If more time is needed, staff is prepared to accommodate that need.

Member comments included:

- Ms. Schilling expressed concern regarding the change in process in that there is no formal recommendation from TPAC to JPACT. She requested clarification regarding the change in process and approach. Mr. Kaempff noted that there is no JPACT meeting in August, so the public comment period could not start until September if needing to wait for a formal TPAC recommendation after the final workshop. As this is just a framework to solicit early public comment and not a policy action by JPACT, staff is asking for TPAC advice on the content and whether those members who staff JPACT representatives will be comfortable with the public comment framework. The intent of the public comment period is to get a feeling of the pulse of the region. Chair Williams added that staff will return to TPAC for review and recommendation of a draft policy document in the fall.
- Ms. Grey asked for additional clarification about the goals, timeline, and process for the policy update. Mr. Kaempff responded that staff wants to ensure the process is meeting the regional needs. If the recommendation goes to TPAC first, it may extend the schedule for in excess of two months. Ms. Cho clarified that the workshops were designed to be open to all stakeholders in addition to members of TPAC to provide opportunity for dialogue about policy options. Final approval is not required at this time. Workshops and discussions at TPAC are geared towards narrowing the options, and the current intent is to allow earlier public participation in the process. Once approvals are needed, the recommendations would follow the usual TPAC/JPACT approval process.
- Ms. Grey expressed concern about this approach. She also asked about sub-regional allocations. Mr. Kaempff clarified that the practice of sub-allocating funds cannot be continued, as the current practice does not meet federal requirements.

- Mr. Leybold concurred, saying that originally, the process was intended to be advisory and to have some flexibility in the process. However, in practice it has become a sub-allocation. The current practice of setting targets must be updated.
- Mr. Gary Schmidt asked for clarification about the process if revisions occur after the initial public comment period and once TPAC and JPACT have approved the options. He asked if the public would see the final version, assuming there are changes after public input. Mr. Kaempff noted that the current schedule does not allow for another public comment period but there could be some flexibility if that is needed.
- Mr. Don Odermott echoed concerns of the previous two speakers. He expressed discomfort with the order of events and the compressed time frame.
- Ms. Chris Deffebach noted that these are wider-ranging policy choices and expressed a preference that TPAC provide a recommendation to JPACT. She stated that TPAC might wish to make recommendations other than those currently being considered. Mr. Kaempff clarified that options would be refined during the afternoon workshop. A more comprehensive format will be presented during the public comment period and to JPACT. After the public comment period, staff will present a report to TPAC. Today's version is a work in progress.
- Ms. Deffebach appreciated the recognition of the geographic distribution question.
- Ms. Kelly Brooks expressed appreciation for the effort so far and requested clarification on current options. She noted that the regional economic opportunity fund work that was done in the past had been educational. ODOT supports a modification of the sub-allocation policy. She believes the change allows funding of a variety of larger scale project with federal dollars. Mr. Kaempff noted that option D includes larger scale projects and that removing target dollar amounts for each project category in Step 2 allows more flexible funding for those projects.
- Ms. Miranda Bateschell said that JPACT will want to see the public comment version that is going to the public. Mr. Kaempff noted that there will not be a vote at JPACT, and that it will be an informational item for JPACT's review and general direction. The matrix will be revised appropriately for JPACT member review following the workshop.
- Mr. Phil Healy observed a lack of description of projects that support economic development. He suggested that support of the business community is important and it would be good to see projects that support job creation or industrial development. He noted concern that this might be missing an opportunity. Mr. Leybold responded that some of these are inherent in the current options.
- Mr. Alan Lehto reminded members of the need to prioritize funding on behalf of the entire region. He emphasized a focus on places where larger projects can have a greater impact.
- Mr. Jared Franz commended Metro for the willingness to bring the public into the process earlier. He noted that often when the public is consulted that ideas / policies are close to complete, so that this change is more meaningful as it includes the public in the shaping of the policy. He also expressed concern about the lack of a second public comment period and expects that there may be substantive comments from the community.
- Mr. Don Odermott commented on the use of federal funds for small projects and the inefficiency in overhead costs. He said that Washington County had better administrative successes with bundled projects. He said the funding can be best leveraged with smart and efficient coordination between projects.

## **8. POWELL-DIVISION ACTION PLAN**

Ms. Malu Wilkinson introduced guest presenters, Alexandra Howard, City of Portland and Brian Martin, the City of Gresham. Ms. Wilkinson provided an overview of the Powell-Division Transit Action Plan, and the action plans for cities of Gresham and Portland. She requested TPAC's recommendation of the Transit Action Plan so that it could go to JPACT for approval. Pending JPACT approval, Metro

Council is scheduled to endorse the Transit Action Plan in September, following endorsements by city councils of Gresham and Portland.

Ms. Wilkinson provided an overview of Metro's Investment Areas approach which combines high capacity transit and multi-modal corridor planning expertise with land use implementation including brownfields, station area planning, industrial land readiness and economic development. Powell-Division exemplifies what it means to be an investment area, as it is a prime opportunity to make the most from limited public funds – the project can include federal transportation funding, or partnering with other programs, cities, counties or community organizations that are all investing in an area. It is the working assumption that public investment catalyzes private development. Since high capacity transit is often one of the largest public investments we can make, we must leverage those funds together for the greatest potential impact and create the most public benefits in an area.

She discussed the work to leverage Metro's resources to provide a place where people want to work, live, and play. The project team adopted a place-based approach, always with the goal to reflect what people most need. Powell-Division is a vibrant, diverse corridor. There are many opportunities to improve and enhance the area and to address some of the issues the area is facing, in terms of safety, investments, and connections. The team has focused on community driven decision making, ensuring that the public has been engaged frequently and meaningfully at multiple stages of the process. This included 250 community events or meetings, 6 online surveys, an online map comment tool, and work with new partners to reach out to diverse groups in numerous languages. She mentioned that there are two major transit connections connecting the downtowns of Portland and Gresham, as well as connections to light rail and significant transit ridership today. There is a good grid network but not many north-south transit routes and a lack of good bike and pedestrian routes. She mentioned there are economic opportunities that, with more investment could provide growth. The area is also an educational corridor, several high schools, community colleges, a natural medicine school and others. The steering committee recommended that the project focus on creating the first bus rapid transit line in the region which will run between Portland and Gresham. At the same time, work has been focused on the investment/development side. The development strategy that has been spurred by a Metro Community Planning and Development Grant (CPDG) awarded to Gresham and Portland, is geared to help define the areas of change and stability, develop policies and projects that can support future station areas, provide community benefits, and align public and private investments to support community goals. A Metro TOD investment project is already underway at the corner of 82<sup>nd</sup> and Division – Metro has purchased a vacant building and leased it for use as a local community center. Lastly, she reviewed the steering committee's major actions, the goals and objectives, and the community engagement program.

Mr. Brian Martin (City of Gresham) provided an overview of the three study areas (182<sup>nd</sup>/Division, downtown Gresham, and the "campus area") that were chosen along the corridor and their focus on how best to support transit and use to best benefit communities. Studies reviewed existing conditions, land use, the real estate market and potential displacement. Primary activities included talking to the community about desired changes around station areas. Respondents asked for safe sidewalks and crosswalks, better stations and bus stops, and stronger connections to community gathering places. This work translated into an action plan which includes city-wide strategies for economic job attraction and retention, housing and jobs downtown, community services and gathering places, safety, affordable housing, and transportation.

Ms. Alex Howard (City of Portland) noted that the two-year Portland Action Plan builds upon past plans. The team acknowledged that transit brings benefits and challenges, so decided early on to consider what might be accomplished in a two-year period of time. So the Portland Action Plan is a

starting point for community stabilization work and concentrates on how the community can best grow and businesses benefit from the investments that will be made in the area, knowing that later actions will build on these early investments. Specific issues include affordable housing and economic development as well as land use near station areas, so that they are integrated into the physical fabric of the community and reflect community needs and identity. Design and development will be focused on the five station areas which are key opportunity areas for specific actions. Those include: the Inner Powell area, Foster/Powell, Jade District, 122<sup>nd</sup>/Division, and 162<sup>nd</sup> / Division. She gave the following examples: multi-dwelling housing preservation program, early business technical assistance, grants to business owners, and formation of a business improvement district. The plan will go to the City of Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission on July 28 to introduce the concept and a more refined version will be available later in the fall.

Ms. Wilkinson shared the steering committee decisions to date which included advancing bus rapid transit, and a general route that crosses the Willamette River using the Tilikum Crossing and runs on Powell Blvd in Southeast Portland, transitioning to Division St in East Portland and continuing to Mt. Hood Community College in Gresham. She noted that community support is in favor of a crossing at SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. So in addition to high capacity transit for the area, other aspects that are being considered include mobility, economic development, and active transportation. In Gresham, the transition from Division is yet to be determined. Additional conversations with the community will be held to determine the best method forward and how to best meet community needs.

An application has been made to the FTA to enter into the project development phase so that local investment resources count as a match towards the overall capital cost of the project. The locally preferred alternative including route decisions and design elements, station spacing and transit service elements are yet to be made by the steering committee. Ms. Wilkinson said her staff will return to TPAC with final options on station spacing and routing. Metro Council is scheduled to endorse the Transit Action Plan in September, following endorsements by city councils of Gresham and Portland.

Member comments included:

- Ms. Grey and Mr. Lehto congratulated Metro, the City of Gresham and the City of Portland and expressed support for the plan.
- Ms. Gossett asked whether the Transit Plan was included in the comprehensive plan and Ms. Howard clarified that it was. Additionally, Ms. Gossett inquired whether changes would be reflected in the zoning. Ms. Howard clarified that in the future, there could be refinements to mixed use zones but nothing is anticipated at this time.
- Mr. Healy appreciated the good outreach and process in East Multnomah County.
- Ms. Schilling expressed her appreciation and clarified with Joanna Valencia that the Multnomah Board would be supporting the process with an IGA. Ms. Wilkinson noted the update and indicated that this information would be reflected in any revisions.
- Mr. Lehto requested a clarification of the more accurate naming of the boulevard to which Ms. Howard agreed and indicated that more satisfactory language would be included in future revisions.

**MOTION:** Ms. Chris Deffebach moved and Mr. Steve White seconded the motion to a recommendation to JPACT to approve the Powell-Division Transit Action Plan.

**ACTION:** With all in favor, the motion passed.



## **9. METRO EQUITY STRATEGY**

Mr. Juan-Carlos Ocana Chiu introduced TPAC members to Metro's Equity Strategy program and timeline, and discussed goals and objectives for the program's outcome. He then asked for feedback from the committee.

Member comments included:

- Ms. Gossett extended an invitation to visit OMSI, as the organization has a long history of experience with underserved communities with special programs, camps, services, and educational opportunities for children.
- Ms. Bateschell commended the project and requested information on how to leverage the information that is being gathered and benefit to provide more equitable outcomes in members' jurisdictions and organizations. Mr. Ocana Chiu appreciated the comment and noted that in the future strategic conversations will be convened to ensure regional participation, and assist partners to increase their capacity to build equitable outcomes.
- Ms. Chris Deffebach asked about the specific longer term outcomes of the program. She suggested that a presentation on the baseline report would be helpful, and to provide context for how it affects coordinating/advisory committees.
- Ms. Judith Grey commented that the work is not just about transportation. In the past TPAC has discussed a goal of more robust approaches to public engagement and equity analysis. She noted previous discussions about a task force that would work to ensure that agencies with limited resources can benefit from this work. Ms. Cho confirmed that the RTP and MTIP Transportation Equity Analysis work program will be evaluating transportation investments with an equity lens. A presentation will be provided to TPAC in August. That discussion will include the possible development of a task force, using information from the framework report, and making those connections. She and staff are working with the Diversity Equity and Inclusion team to ensure that the RTP update will be synced up with these programs as well.
- Mr. Lehto also requested that the baseline report be brought to TPAC.

**10. ADJOURN** Chair Williams noted that the next meeting will be July 31. He adjourned the meeting at 11:59 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Hunrichs, Planning and Development

**ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF JUNE 26, 2015**

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOC DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
1.0	Agenda	6/26/2015	Meeting agenda	062615T-01
1.0	Work Program	6/26/2015	Work program	062615T-02
4.0	Meeting Minutes	5/29/15	Meeting minutes	062615T-03
5.0	Resolution	June 2015	Resolution 15-4633	062615T-04
5.0	Exhibit	June 2015	Exhibit A, Resolution 15-4633	062615T-05
5.0	Memo	6/9/2015	Staff Report regarding Resolution 15-4633	062615T-06
6.0	Memo	6/17/2015	Freight Demand Modeling & Data Improvement Project	062615T-07
6.0	Memo	6/17/2015	Regional Freight Funding Update	062615T-08
6.0	Handout	July 2015	Draft Resolution 15-4637	062615T-09
7.0	Memo	6/17/2015	2018-2021 MTIP and 2019-2021 RFFA Policy Update – Progress to Date and Next Steps	062615T-10
8.0	Resolution	Sept. 2015	Draft Resolution 15-4634	062615T-11
8.0	Handout	5/11/2015	Powell-Division Transit and Development Project Transit Action Plan	062615T-12
9.0	Memo	3/20/2015	Comments and recommendations on the “Equity Baseline Report: A Framework for Regional Equity”	062615T-13
9.0	Memo	4/14/2015	Direction for the creation of options for the adoption of the Equity Strategy and Action Plan	062615T-14
9.0	Memo	6/5/2015	Equity Strategy and Action Plan Timeline (Draft June 5, 2015)	062615T-15
9.0	Handout	June 2015	Equity Strategy and Action Plan Timeline (Draft June 5, 2015)	062615T-16