



# Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, March 9, 2018 | 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

---

## **Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Chris Deffebach  
Mark Lear  
Nancy Kraushaar  
Kelly Betteridge  
Jon Makler  
Carley Francis  
Phil Healy  
Tyler Bullen  
Glenn Koehrsen  
Emily Lai  
Beverly Drottar

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Washington County  
City of Portland  
City of Wilsonville and Cities of Clackamas County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Port of Portland  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative

## **Alternates Attending**

Jessica Berry  
Dayna Webb  
Todd Juhasz  
Lidwien Rahman

## **Affiliate**

Multnomah County  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Beaverton and Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation

## **Members Excused**

Joanna Valencia  
Lynda David  
Katherine Kelly  
Don Odermott  
Cory Ann Wind  
Rachael Tupica  
Alfred McQuarters  
Maria Hernandez

## **Affiliate**

Multnomah County  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Federal Highway Administration  
Community Representative  
Community Representative

## **Guests Attending**

Kari Schlosshauer  
Jeff Pazdalski  
Hannah Day-Kapell

## **Affiliate**

Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership  
Westside Transportation Alliance  
Alta Planning & Design

## **Metro Staff Attending**

Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager	Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner	Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Associate Transportation Planner
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner	Clifford Higgins, Communications Manager
Frankie Lewington, Associate Public Relations	Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

## 1. Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chair Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. and declared a quorum was present. Introductions were made by TPAC members, alternates, staff and guests attending the meeting.

## 2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Corrective Actions and Recommendations on Federal MPO Certifications (Tom Kloster)** Chair Kloster provided an overview of Metro's 2017 Federal Certification Review that certifies our MPO process, not program plans. The Federal Highway Administration sent Metro its' findings with recommendations and corrective actions. Metro has responded with plans to take action on these points and expects an approval letter in the next 2 months.

Ted Leybold reviewed the corrective actions responses Metro is planning. Most are directed for more clarity and financial documentation. Discussing correction action under Civil Rights and Environmental Justice, it was asked how Metro was working though ADA requirements. Chair Kloster reported that if jurisdictions or agencies receive federal funds, entire agencies are subject to comply with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. Questions remain on which department agencies should use to address these issues. More will be known as work is done.

TPAC will review the self-certification process and recommendations from the Federal review in coming meetings. Jon Makler requested that ODOT be contacted in advance of the letter sent to the Federal Highway Administration for input and feedback in the response next year. For better collaboration, this was agreed.

- **UPWP Quarterly Reports and MTIP Amendments Quarterly Reports (Ken Lobeck)** Ken Lobeck provided the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter FFY 2018 MTIP Amendment Report and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter SFY 2017-18 UPWP Summary Report. A total of 58 MTIP amendments were approved. There were 34 Administrative Modifications approved with 24 Formal MTIP amendments. The UPWP Quarterly report showed 12 regionally significant UPWP projects. For questions on any of the reports, please contact Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead.
- **Special TPAC Meeting, April 20 (Tom Kloster)** Chair Kloster announced that a special TPAC meeting was being called on Friday, April 20, in addition to the scheduled April 6 meeting. The reason for this was an attempt to keep pace with RTP and other issues coming before TPAC for consideration. Agenda updates for both the April 6 TPAC and April 4 Joint TPAC/MTAC work program schedules, as well as the April 20 TPAC meeting will be made to better balance agenda items and time for full discussion. It was agreed there was a lot to read, study and be prepared to discuss with RTP topics (and others) at these meetings. Receiving materials in advance is needed. In addition, it was suggested to cut the time of agenda presentations in half, possibly 5-10 minutes, and allow full discussion time with the remainder of agenda items. Staff will be reminded of these changes for presentations. TPAC acknowledged the need for more RTP staff in which to work through processes.
- Jon Makler reiterated from the Joint TPAC/MTAC workshop presentation March 7 on upcoming STIP leverage activities that ODOT welcomes jurisdictions to help identify opportunities for investing for adding safety, active transportation and enhanced elements to Fix-It projects. ODOT will be reaching out to coordinating committees and others in the next 1-2 months. The 150% list is expected to be completed and ready for input starting April 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Kelly Betteridge announced that the position Eric Hesse held at TriMet is now being recruited. Until this position is filled, Ms. Betteridge will be attending TPAC meetings representing TriMet.

- Jon Makler announced that the position of Policy & Development Director formerly held by Kelly Brooks, has been filled by Mandy Putney. Ms. Putney's former position as Projects Manager is now vacant and being recruited. ODOT has learned that the legislature has granted them a new Principal Planner for Transit in major projects position. This will include work with SW Corridors, Division Transit, ETC and more. Recruitment for this position opens soon.

**3. Public Communications on Agenda Items - None**

**4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from Feb.2, 2018**

**MOTION: To approve the minutes from Feb. 2, 2018 as presented.**

Moved: Todd Juhasz

Seconded: Glenn Koehrsen

**ACTION: Motion passed with two abstentions: Jessica Berry and Nancy Kraushaar.**

- 5. MTIP Formal Amendment 18-4876** Ken Lobeck provided an overview of Resolution 18-4876, that is the March 2018 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendment bundle containing required changes and updates impacting Metro, Multnomah County, ODOT, and Portland. Five projects are included in the amendment bundle. Three of the four projects in the March 2018 bundle are new projects being added to the 2018 MTIP.

**MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT for Resolution 18-4876.**

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously**

- 6. Recommendation to JPACT on Draft 2018-19 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)** John Mermin presented the current draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) with track changes that had been provided to the committee in their packet. Mr. Mermin reminded the committee of the purpose of the UPWP; annual federally-required documentation that ensures efficient use of federal planning funds with descriptions of transportation planning tasks, budget summaries and relationships to other planning activities in the region. What UPWP does not do is serve as a regional policy making document, is not a funding decision document allocating funds, no construction, design or preliminary engineering, only includes transportation planning projects, federal funding, for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Mermin asked for input and suggestions to improve the UPWP, and to make a recommendation to JPACT at their March 15, 2018 meeting, which includes these inputs, for their review. JPACT is expected to then take action on the UPWP April 19, then for Metro Council action May 3, and to be submitted to USDOT and ODOT on May 4, 2018.

Comments from the committee:

- Glenn Koehrsen asked that reference of the Coordinated Transportation Plan (CTP) that includes services to seniors and people with disabilities be included in the Regional Transportation Plan Update narrative section of the UPWP. This is currently referenced in the Introduction section of the document, but will be added with other related UPWP planning activities. More effort will be made to include the CTP in the UPWP and other transportation planning documents.
- Mr. Koehrsen asked that wording on page 45, seventh bullet under Objectives, be clarified. It was agreed that "by" be taken out of the sentence.

- Karen Buehrig commented on the document clear formatting with appreciation for the amount of work put into the project. One question on the document concerns possible overlaps between Regional Transportation Planning and Regional Transit Planning throughout the document, without defining FTE time as either totals or sectional.
- Ms. Buehrig referred to page 27 of the UPWP referencing FY anticipated costs and funding sources for the RTP budget. It appeared not enough was budgeted for the FTE work of RTP. Chair Kloster reported that the RTP budget is lean, but with the coming first half of the FY 2018-19, a shift to work on the Mobility project will allow the RTP budget to lessen. This can be adjusted for an extension of work on RTP if needed.
- Ms. Buehrig asked for clarification on Corridor Refinement and Project Development (Investment Areas), with FY 2017-18 FTE as 0.5, rising to FY 2018-19 FTE 3.1. (pages 114-115) How are the projects identified, what is the project(s) working on, and are they included in the Investment Areas of the UPWP also? These questions will be given to Malu Wilkinson for clarification.
- Jon Makler asked for more description and narrative formatting clarification in the section “Division Transit Project (Powell/Division Transit and Development Project). (pages 116-120)
- Mr. Makler commented on the Mobility Policy Refinement Planning section of UPWP (pages 86-89). The UPWP describes two major policy frameworks with the project; one being a corridor-specific mobility strategy developed for the National Highway System, the second being a mobility corridor-based strategy for managing congestion on regional arterial streets that support the interstate and statewide highways, and incorporated into the RTP. More clarification with federal requirements of the two frameworks needs to be described. When asked if this was a design purpose or mobility reporting issue, Mr. Makler that these two frameworks help us develop the mobility policy, but the issue is already federally mandated for the National Highway System.
- Chris Deffebach asked for a change in wording with Complete Streets, page 90, under paragraph 2 that states “Additionally, transportation projects funded with federal Regional Flexible Funds must follow the design guidelines”. Rather than “must follow”, perhaps change this to “must consider”. Ted Leybold responded that the policy had not changed, and noted that the guidelines offer flexibility. It was decided to strike the sentence from the narrative to avoid confusion.
- Ms. Deffebach commented on the Research Center data tools having not been updated for several years.
- The Mobility Corridor issues being developed with this first pass is good, but the description in the UPWP needs more clarification.
- Discussion held on corridor planning and selection of next corridor projects with funds. An update on proposals, why these were selected, and where in the UPWP and RTP this planning was included. Kim Ellis reported that the implementation chapter of the RTP would include corridor planning information, but at this time the ability to prioritize the order of corridor projects was not recommended. More clarification on how corridors identified in the RTP for implementation coincide with next years’ UPWP would be welcome.

**Motion: To ensure an adequately staffed RTP for reaching goals with a budget based performance process, TPAC approves the UPWP with the following Amendment:**

**TPAC makes a statement in order to ensure that the RTP development process goal of a meaningful budget based performance process be included in the recommendation to JPACT for significant increase in funds for the RTP development and monitoring process. This could include additional funding or reassigning existing staff.**

Moved: Mark Lear

Chair Kloster suggested that rather a motion be made on the UPWP for actions on the budget, since the UPWP has set amounts for projects through JPACT and Metro Council approval. A suggestion was made to correspond to JPACT and Metro Council on concerns with adequate RTP staff funding. Karen Buehrig suggested that a separate motion could be proposed that highlighted TPAC's concerns on the proposed budget through official communications. Mr. Lear emphasized the need for a strong statement, not just a suggestion as adoption of the UPWP is being processed. The second motion was asked from Mr. Lear. Concerning more priority goals addressed to equity, safety and vision zero, with the UPWP showing less than 1 FTE for Civil Rights and Environmental Justice, more prioritizing difference needs to be done.

**Motion: In order to ensure that the region lead with higher standards with equity, safety and vision zero, the UPWP should be modified to address these new priorities.**

Moved: Mark Lear

Chair Kloster recommended that the motion become a submittal statement to JPACT and Metro Council to accompany the UPWP, with TPAC concerns on budget capacity. Additional comments on the UPWP were requested.

Comments from the committee:

- Kelly Betteridge enquired why the Enhanced Transit Corridor (ETC) was not in the UPWP, given that matching funds could be federally linked. Currently the ETC is listed under Regional Transit Strategy, with Jamie Snook the contact lead. Ms. Snook reported that as transit strategy declined in the next FY, work with ETC increases. Consideration will be given for determining if ETC remains under transit strategy or changes to a stand-alone category in the UPWP.
- Ms. Betteridge asked if the Red Line Extension Project would be listed as its own project with narrative. In addition, the Powell Garage Project will be receiving federal funding, with future potential federal funding separate from the Division Project. Consideration of these projects will be given as separate projects in the UPWP.

*Note: at 10:30 a.m. Carley Francis left the meeting.*

Returning to conversation with earlier motions, Karen Buehrig considered this an opportunity for TPAC to address the RTP budget with Metro Council, not always having this voice directly. Mark Lear commented on asking to modify these plans with UPWP wherein agencies might abstain from their support if issues of equity, safety and vision zero were not fully addressed. Ted Leybold asked for

clarity with the motion if this was a change in resolution and document adoption, or change in budget vs. correspondence.

Mr. Lear felt both a change in the UPWP adoption that acknowledged the need for more funding, and another statement that addressed the safety, equity and zero vision issues with options for amendments to the resolution. Chair Kloster suggested addressing Metro Council with concern on the work programs not have capacity for full RTP program support. Mr. Lear added that moving existing dollars in the budget could be proposed within the budget. Ms. Buehrig suggested shifting transportation planning staff budgets to others addressing this issue earmarked in the discussion. Nancy Kraushaar suggested Metro Council urged to explore allocating additional funding.

Jon Makler commented on Metro's set budget with project priority for MPO/UPWP projects. Mr. Makler felt that narrative description for clarity may better address where funding could be allocated. Mark Lear commented on the strong feedback at the recent Regional Leadership Forum where the issues being discussed was appropriate and relevant to this discussion. Chris Deffebach suggested that it was appropriate to raise these issues in the narratives, while noting that some projects needed more adequate RTP funding for activities, in both timeline of projects and staff time.

Phil Healy asked that if the adopted budget is set and cannot be changed, when or if the Metro Council could consider a change in budget. If too late to change the budget or move funding around, what's the next step? Chair Kloster reported on the budget process with budget allocation for all of Metro, and those with the budget of the MPO, and reminded committee members that the purpose of the UPWP is to coordinate among federally funded planning projects, not to make budget decisions. TPAC concerns with the MPO and federal funding of transportation projects can be addressed to both JPACT and Metro Council.

**Motion: In consideration of recommending adoption of the UPWP as presented, recognizing that representation that the UPWP risks not being able to achieve the safety and equity vision that stakeholders at forums have articulated, and given that we have identified this risk, we would add two possible amendments to this motion.**

- 1. Metro to seek additional resources beyond what is currently allocated to the UPWP projects to increase the chance we can achieve these goals, and**
- 2. Metro to ask TPAC to convene to discuss in more detail possible recommendations for increasing/decreasing funding in the UPWP to increase safety and equity goals.**

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Mark Lear

Further discussion:

- Nancy Kraushaar asked where in the motion directing more funding toward RTP staffing would be. It was agreed this would be added to the motion amendments.
- Kelly Betteridge asked where recommendations would begin in discussions for funding allocation. It was agreed that staff would begin a draft of recommended reallocations in the UPWP. Past drafts of budgets with narratives and descriptions could be reviewed with the process.

- Emily Lai asked for clarification on the process and how RTP is addressed. With equity and safety as key issues, there was concern current budgeted resources would not address the issues fully. Amendments to the adopted UPWP could be presented, RTP specifically addressed within these amendments.
- Chris Deffebach commented on concerns getting too deep in the proposed amendments tying FTE with funding allocations.
- Tyler Bullen appreciated having safety and equity acknowledged, but where was climate smart issues with concerns. It appeared not to be addressed in the UPWP. It was questioned if having more staff at Metro would create solutions for equity, safety and climate smart issues, or if taking resources away from projects for more staff would help achieve the stated goals on these issues.
- Mark Lear added that performance targets in Climate Smart are tied to Vision Zero. Strategically, more staff resources with federal funding could help achieve these goals.

**Revised Motion read by TPAC recorder: In consideration of recommending adoption of the UPWP as written and presented, recognizing that representation of the UPWP risks not being able to achieve the safety and equity vision that Metro has prioritized to address safety and equity, and given that we have identified this risk, TPAC recommends adoption of this UPWP with the following two amendments added:**

1. **Metro to consider additional resources for RTP development beyond what is currently allocated to the UPWP projects to increase the chance we can achieve these goals, specifically in safety and equity projects, and**
2. **Metro to ask TPAC to convene for further discussion to create optional proposals with allocated resources for possible recommendations that would increase/decrease funding in the UPWP to address safety and equity goals.**

**ACTION: Motion to approve the recommendation (before attachment of added amendments):**

11 votes in favor: Karen Buehrig, Jessica Berry, Mark Lear, Nancy Kraushaar, Todd Juhasz, Kelly Betteridge, Jon Makler, Phil Healy, Tyler Bullen, Glenn Koerhsen, Emily Lai

1 vote opposed: Beverly Drottar

1 abstention: Chris Deffebach

**ACTION: Motion carried.**

**ACTION Motion for Recommendation to JPACT adoption of the UPWP with above amendments added, that JPACT forward to the Metro Council upon their approval of the UPWP.**

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Mark Lear

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously**

7. **Refining 2018 RTP Investment Priorities** Kim Ellis provided an update on the March 2 Regional Leadership Forum and recommendations for refining draft project lists. Information has been compiled from public comments, jurisdictional input, Community Leaders' Forum and the Regional Leadership Forum. Following the Regional Leadership Forum, recommendations were drafted for refining priorities with project lists and RTP investments. These were presented for TPAC review and discussion:

1. Make more near-term progress on key regional priorities – equity, safety, travel options and congestion.
2. Reduce disparities and barriers that exist for historically marginalized communities, especially people of color and households of modest means.
3. Prioritize projects that focus on safety in high injury corridors
4. Accelerate transit service expansion
5. Tackle congestion and manage travel demand
6. Prioritize completion of biking and walking network gaps
7. Continue to build public trust through inclusive engagement, transparency and accountability

TPAC was asked to make a recommendation to JPACT on reviewing and refining the draft project lists to make more progress on equity, safety, travel options, congestion and Climate Smart Strategy, use the forum key takeaways as direction on where to focus refinements, and agencies to submit changes to the draft RTP project list by April 27 with a summary of what changes and how changes addressed regional priorities. The revised project lists will then be evaluated in May and June and subject to further public review in summer 2018 as part of the final 45-day public comment period planned for June 29 to August 13. Ms. Ellis reminded the committee that the RTP was required to be adopted by the end of the year to meet federal requirements and remain eligible for federal funding.

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear commented on the need for follow up with elected officials and leaders at the table with the updated changes in the project lists. Another suggestion was that with some opinion of the RTP as a rollup of local TSPs, it would help for a way of communications draft of project review involve local public input. Having this involvement with TriMet, local and regional projects, not just those in the TSP, would provide useful feedback.
- Jon Makler questioned why, in this phase of project priority review, we are revising the lists. It was not anticipated that more projects would possibly be entered in the list at this point. Chair Kloster reminded the committee that this second round of refinement was designed into the RTP process to respond to the results of the initial analysis and public input.
- Karen Buehrig commented on the recommendations for changes to projects, and confirmed this information would be used on the development of the policies and strategies also. Ms. Buehrig reminded the committee that many projects in the first 10 years of the project lists have committed funding. And while we have aspirational goals with these first 10 years of projects, there are limitations to this. Regarding transit service and the need for additional services, it would be helpful to have TriMet present information on the additional funding (HB2017) with functions and timelines related to this funding. The assumptions with enhanced transit service will affect us on how we can achieve Climate Smart goals and plan future progress on transit services. The TriMet presentation is scheduled for TPAC on May 4.
- Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on the approach to congestion. Referring to the seven key takeaways from the Forum, easing congestion is listed in the near-term period. But it appears to be listed with designs, travel information, technologies and other strategies in the use to maximize use of the existing system. Addressing plans to reduce congestion with bottlenecks should be included. Ms. Ellis confirmed the three bottleneck projects that received HB 2017 funding are.
- In the list, “Accelerate transit service expansion” appears to call for current of future funding. Ms. Ellis confirmed this was new revenue accounted for in the next round of funding.



Ms. Deffebach commented on the need for better coding of project lists submitted. Washington County did not include local streets in Active Transportation Plan in the RTP. Matching performance measures with the project descriptions submitted will be valuable.

It was asked if the county coordinating committees needed approval for these projects. While not required, it was agreed to be valuable, and by April 27 the jurisdictions should have their information updated in the hub for tracking projects throughout the region, and transmittals from the coordinating committees could follow in May like was done last summer.

- Jon Makler expressed concern with asking for consideration of the Forum Key Takeaways as direction to make further refinements to RTP investments, due to the number of priorities calling for progress on equity, safety, travel options, congestion, and Climate Smart Strategy.
- Emily Lai asked where the “Lead with Equity” was in the Key Takeaways. This needs to be spelled out in the goals and outcomes of projects. Asking for clarification on conflicts with ODOTs concern with changing the list of priorities, Mr. Makler responded. ODOT formed the list of projects best matched with criteria and budget for RTP investments. But if asked to recommend making refinements to the list based on key forum takeaways, it sets up expectations that ODOT will revise the current list. ODOT feels we made the right investments in the first place, and if revising the priorities it could imply that ODOT is not making the right selection of projects with the budget.
- Mark Lear felt that “direction” was clear and supported the emphasis of equity and safety.
- Jessica Berry acknowledged that some tweaks could be made with the projects submitted for Multnomah County. It was felt that some jurisdictions may have provided a more complete description of projects and the potential refinements may vary across the region.
- Karen Buehrig commented on the different jurisdictions with submitted projects not having the same capabilities to achieve the safety, equity and other priorities. Reflecting these takeaways might be a better framework with the projects, with evaluations following implementations on how they can be improved.
- Kelly Betteridge felt that as we develop the updated list of projects, we prove better definition of what outcomes the projects will deliver.
- Nancy Kraushaar commented on new employment areas that are in the project list, that while these are important to her part of region, are not always of the same level of importance to other parts of the region. These key takeaways were more for guidance, as there are different priorities in different parts of the region.
- Chris Deffebach added that it’s hard to measure safety and equity in projects and we need to fine tune the project descriptions and measures. These expectations are high, and individually we won’t make much of a dent as a whole, but together we are making the attempt to reach these goals. Stories and narratives need to be added as part of submitting refinements to project lists.

In conclusion, Ms. Ellis will take the feedback provided by TPAC to JPACT for further discussion on refinements on the project list and regional priorities.

**8. Updated 2018 RTP Financial Forecast** Ted Leybold provided draft updated 2018 RTP Financial Forecasts. Knowing that potential impacts to our updated revenue forecasts are needed for reviews with the refinement project lists, these draft numbers are not final, but are intended to provide an estimate of what jurisdictions can work with on changes as they affect the financial picture. The first handout “HB 2017 Gas Tax/Vehicle Registration/Privilege Tax Revenue Adjustment” provides an estimate of new revenues by jurisdictions, rolled into RTP finance budgets to be reviewed with refinement project lists.

Referring to the second handout “HB2017 Revenue Additions and Federal Fund Reductions”, a small reduction will be seen from Regional Flexible Fund Forecast due to not including the previous forecast purchasing power year of expenditure dollars to capital cost expenditures. Adjustment to the cost of inflation with this purchasing power has been made.

With no guarantee these additional funds will come, but estimating the capacity of additional revenue, listed under Additions, there is a Safe Routes to Schools program with \$80 million for the region, based on 2016 purchasing power, reduced for inflation. The Bridges and Seismic Improvements to Highway and Bridges revenue program are divided by counties from a total of just over \$56 million.

Under general revenues, divided by sub-regions, all four agencies need to identify how much of these revenues should be committed to their capital needs or their local Operations & Maintenance needs. These numbers reflect the reduced 2016 purchasing power. Metro will be asking how the agencies plan to use the revenue between capital/O&M. The last chart shown is the Net Total Adjustments, with the reduction and additions for forecast revenue.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked if this was the same percentage split used by ODOT; Metro agreed. For bridges, were these estimates made for County-wide, or Metro UGB areas? Mr. Leybold will check back with answers to this later. Ms. Deffebach requested clarification on the adjustment to 2016 numbers. We can assume growth of revenues, and assume that inflation will take away from purchasing power. The unknown year of when projects will use these revenues creates the advantage to adjust to 2016 purchasing power for forecasting.
- Karen Buehrig appreciated the forecast numbers, but it didn't reflect based on what would be spent on maintenance and capital. Clackamas County has 10% available for capital spending, which is significantly less than what is shown in the charts. With input given to project refinement lists, are their dates when the revisions with numbers need to come to Metro? Mr. Leybold will be connecting with the Counties for this information.
- Mark Lear commented that regarding TSP some growth was expected in gas tax. We are not updating our TSP to add money in. Didn't Metro assume some increase in gas tax in the constrained financial forecast? Why forecast this as new money? Mr. Leybold explained that if the existing cost of gas stayed at 30 cents per gallon more people would buy. When asked jurisdictions if they assumed their TSP rates would go up, they said no. Therefore, this assumption is listed as new revenue. If assumptions are made for rising rates for gas, adjustments will need to be made. In the RTP financial there was an assumption of a 1 cent increase per year to maintenance. Mr. Leybold concurred that this was true on the ODOT side, but hadn't heard if true on the local side.

Mr. Leybold provided an overview of the handout “TriMet Operating Draft Costs Revenues”. With questions on potential new transit services from HB2017 revenues, this chart reflects on TriMet draft revenues, not including C-Tran and SMART. Starting with revenues, and subtracting round one

modeling costs, replacement costs, expansion costs and additional operating capital costs, the difference shows a 10% increase level of service for TriMet with more capacity for transit.

9. **Draft Regional Travel Options (RTO) Strategy** Daniel Kaempff provided an overview of the 2018 Regional Travel Options Strategy, to affirm policy direction of this draft RTO strategy, and request recommendation to JPACT for adoption. Responding to policy direction the goal is to increase public participation in travel option programs and increase the number of capacity of partners.

Hannah Day-Kapell, Alta Planning & Design, reported that following the public comment period on the draft strategy plan, there were 57 comments, with nine organizations adding input, confirming the direction of the plan with valuable feedback. It was noted that goal one has changed somewhat with a shift away from just vehicle miles traveled to recognizing the benefits to underserved communities where more transportation modes can be offered. With this, the RTO program broadens equity and geographic outreach.

For implementing the program, we need to support, strengthen Core partners through ongoing funding and technical assistance, and support emerging partners to develop and grow new programs towards the strength of the Core partners. In addition, the RTO program coordinates partner sharing of marketing resources, sponsorship of local community engagement events, and grant funds for innovation, small infrastructure and outreach.

Safe Routes to Schools program has 2 threads. One being to support local partners (counties, cities, school districts, community organizations) in developing educational and outreach programs. And providing regional coordination with the program in working groups, technical assistance, data collection and maintenance. The next steps are developing the investment methodology through support of core partners and developing emerging partners with recommended funding levels for each. A detailed proposal will be brought to TPAC and MTAC for review.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked what changes were made in the comments from the previous list. It was noted that new responses will be included that didn't make it in the list previously. There are no changes in the Strategic Plan document. It was suggested to simplify the various goals and strategies in the plan.
- Jessica Berry acknowledged the need to not lose the opportunity for emerging partners to have funding for programs. If only the core partners are funded, what's left? This will be addressed with specific funding targeted to new programs.
- Todd Juhasz was concerned on the expenditure with education for Safe Routes to School (SRTS). He would rather this funding spent on capital projects or the hiring of more people. What type of program evaluation planning is there to justify this spending? Mr. Kaempff provided information on the successful program evaluations already in place with SRTS, adding that it was not only an educational program, but public safety and community awareness program.
- Emily Lai questioned where the data from these goals and strategy came from. There is a conflict of interest if the same non-profit organizations receiving the funding are providing the majority of the data. It doesn't appear the programs are achieving equity goals. Teaching children to ride bikes, but not have access for this activity, shows that funding for this program with no related transportation program identified is misplaced.
- Todd Juhasz commented from his perspective that if getting capital project funding, they produce a solutions based evaluation, with people on the ground, not necessarily more education. At the end of this program funding, will we be able to measure this in a more

statistical way, with factors that point to expenditure of funds strongly calculated to education focus. It was confirmed these be addressed in the program policy. The City of Portland offered to share more with their evaluations with the SRTS program.

- Karen Buehrig expressed support of the RTO program, with appreciation for the ability to retool the strategies each time the plan was updated. She looked forward to seeing the development of the funding opportunities. It was agreed that the amount of services for programs will be dependent on the amount of resources, including bikes to bike lanes/sidewalks.

**ACTION: Motion to recommend to JPACT the adoption of the draft 2018 Regional Travel Option Strategy.**

Moved: Karen Buehrig                      Seconded: Glenn Koehrsen

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously**

**10. TransPort Lead Roles and Work Plan Update** – Agenda item tabled for another meeting

**11. Adjourn**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,



Marie Miller  
TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, March 9, 2018

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	3/9/18	3/9/18 TPAC Agenda	030918T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	3/5/2018	2018 TPAC Work Program	030918T-02
3	Handout	2/14/18	Letter from Margi Bradway, Metro to Phillip Ditzler, FHWA with following USDOT Findings and Metro Responses from 2017 Federal Certification Review	030918T-03
4	Memo	2/27/2018	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: MTIP 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter FFY 2018 Completed Amendments and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter SFY 2017-18 UPWP Summary Report	030918T-04
5	Meeting minutes draft from 2/2/2018	2/2/18	Resolution 18-4870 for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP involving nine projects requiring programming additions, corrections, or cancellations impacting OPRD, ODOT, SMART, and TriMet	030918T-05
6	Resolution 18-4876	2/26/18	Resolution 18-4876 Adding or amending to the MTIP	030918T-06
7	Exhibit A to Resolution 18-4876	2/26/18	Exhibit A to Resolution 18-4876, March 2018 MTIP Bundle	030918T-07
8	Memo	2/26/18	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: March 2018 MTIP Formal Amendment plus Approval Request for Resolution 18-4876	030918T-08
9	Attachment 1 to Resolution 18-4876	2/26/18	Attachment 1 to Resolution 18-4876, Location Maps and OTC Letters	030918T-09
10	Memo	3/5/18	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner RE: 2018-19 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	030918T-10
11	Document	Feb. 2018	Draft 2018-19 Unified Planning Work Program	030918T-11
12	Memo	3/2/18	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: Refining 2018 RTP Investment Priorities	030918T-12
13	Handout	Feb. 2018	RTP: What we heard, public comments	030918T-13
14	Handout	N/A	Comment letters from agencies and partners on 2018 RTP	030918T-14
15	Memo	3/2/18	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2018 Regional Travel Options Strategy Funding Methodology	030918T-15

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
16	Resolution	Feb. 2018	Resolution for the purpose of adopting Regional Travel Options Strategy	030918T-16
17	Staff Report	3/2/18	Staff Report: In consideration of Resolution 18-XXXX for the purpose of Adopting the 2018 Regional Travel Options Strategy	030918T-17
18	Document	March 2018	Draft 2018 Regional Travel Options Strategy	030918T-18
19	Memo	3/3/18	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner RE: TransPort Lead Roles and Work Plan Update	030918T-19
20	Handout	March 2018	Regional Leadership Forum 4 Summary	030918T-20
21	Handout	3/9/18	HB2017 Gas Tax/Vehicle Registration/Privilege Tax Revenue Adjustments	030918T-21
22	Handout	3/9/18	HB2017 Revenue Additions and Federal Fund Reductions	030918T-22
23	Handout	3/9/18	2018 RTP TriMet Operating Draft Costs Revenues	030918T-23
24	Handout	3/8/18	TransPort Membership	030918T-24
25	Presentation	3/9/18	2018-21 MTIP	030918T-25
26	Presentation	3/9/18	2018-19 Unified Planning Work Program	030918T-26
27	Presentation	3/9/18	2018 RTP: Refining RTP Investment Priorities	030918T-27
28	Presentation	3/9/18	2018 RTP Federal and State Constrained Revenues Forecast Update	030918T-28
29	Presentation	3/9/18	2018 Regional Travel Options Strategy	030918T-29