



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, March 6, 2020 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Jessica Berry
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Jeff Owen
Tyler Bullen
Glenn Koehrsen
Jessica Stetson

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
TriMet
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Mark Lear
Jaimie Huff
Garet Prior
Glen Bolen
Cole Grisham
Karen Williams
Mike Coleman

Affiliate

City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Port of Portland

Members Excused

Eric Hesse
Don Odermott
Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Laurie Lebowsky
Tom Bouillion
Donovan Smith
Gladys Alvarado
Idris Ibrahim
Yousif Ibrahim
Wilson Munoz
Taren Evans
Rachael Tupica
Jennifer Campos
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy

Affiliate

City of Portland
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Clark County
C-Tran System

Jeremy Borrego
Cullen Stephenson

Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Kirsten Pennington
Doug Allen
Anna Slatinsky
Charlie Clark
Emma Sagor
Kari Schlosshauer

Affiliate

WSP
AORTA
City of Beaverton
TriMet
City of Portland Bureau of Transportation
Safe Routes to Schools Partnership

Metro Staff Attending

Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Randy Tucker, Policy Advisory IV
Matthew Hampton, Sr. Transportation Planner
Jake Lovell, Planning & Development, Intern

Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
John Mermin, Regional Transportation Planner
Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Investment Areas Project Mgr.
Peter Bosa, Principal Researcher and Modeler
Eliot Rose, Sr. Tech/Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

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

Chairman Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was declared of members present. Introductions were made by members, public audience and staff attending.

- Jeff Owen announced this was his last week at TriMet, and will be starting a new position soon at Nelson Nygaard. For the future, TriMet alternate members on TPAC Kelly Betteridge and Tom Mills will attend to represent TriMet until a permanent TPAC member is named.
- Chairman Kloster noted new locations for upcoming TPAC meetings listed in the work program. TPAC is scheduled to meet at Ride Connection in April, at Marquis Tualatin in July, and in Gresham in October.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Monthly Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck)
Ken Lobeck noted the memo in the packet regarding the March 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) monthly submitted amendments. MTIP formal amendments and administrative modifications project lists for January and February 2020 timeframe was provided with final approval by Federal Transit Administration pending. For questions on the amendments and/or projects statuses contact Mr. Lobeck.
- **Fatal Crashes Update** (Lake McTighe)
Lake McTighe presented information on current fatal crash data in the region, including an annual crash update fact sheet and traffic fatalities and serious injuries annual performance report in the meeting packet. Ms. McTighe noted a correction in the memo that added one additional fatal crash in Washington County.

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear noted the importance with the report with safety teams and transportation task force with this information. The City of Portland continues to address the concern

with speed on roads, and challenges with crashes involving signals by themselves with motorists and pedestrians.

- Mike Coleman asked why the difference between actual fatalities in 2018 where reported in numbers between the fact sheet and the performance report. Ms. McTighe noted the data reported was both actual numbers of observed crashes and over a 5-year rolling average. Table headings are used to avoid confusion.
- Glenn Koehrsen suggested finding an alternate word to describe speed which can be at odds with addressing safety. When used together, speed and safety give conflicting messages.
- Katherine Kelly appreciated the information and asked that the information be provided to JPACT as well.
- Chris Deffebach noted that just changing the posted speed is not enough, that roads need to be designed to manage speeds as well.
- Jeff Owen appreciated the comments to be shared with TriMet as well. With a recent fatal crash right outside TriMet office, the impact of seeing first hand crashes such as these bring home the importance to safety in our region.

(Different topic)

- Chairman Kloster noted a Tribal Government training that Ms. McTighe has been attending. Ms. McTighe will be asked to share some of the information from the training at a future TPAC meeting, and can serve as a resource for jurisdictions on these issues.

- **2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Administrative Amendment; Bus on Shoulder Pilot & Feasibility Assessment** (John Mermin)

John Mermin noted the memo in the packet that describes the administrative amendment to the 2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) regarding ODOT's Region 1 Bus-On-Shoulder Pilots and Feasibility Assessment program. Following this notification to TPAC, the amendment will be forwarded to USDOT staff for approval.

3. Public & Committee Communications on Agenda Items

- Doug Allen from the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates commented on agenda items. In the MTIP amendment regarding the Rose Quarter project that advanced right-of-way access, Mr. Allen advocated removing this from the project. By doing so, it would reinforce the message from local public leaders and informed citizens to the Oregon Transportation Commission they should order a full review to transit options including tolling and access points to relieve congestion.

Also in the MTIP, Mr. Allen noted the removal of the temporary removal of the Red Line Extension to Gateway Double Track project. Regional cost effectiveness and equity questions were noted.

Mr. Allen noted the importance of the Congestion Pricing Study taking a regional approach that would improve the entire system of reducing greenhouse gas, emissions and having toll revenue used to address these issues. HB 2017 authorized the whole system to address tolling management, not for revenue alone, but to improve transit and increase efficient travel. Mr.

Allen recommended an evaluation of on-ramp approach to tolling that could allow for freight and passenger bypass lanes, better flow of traffic by improved designs, and a full regional overview in the system.

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from February 7, 2020

Corrections noted by Karen Williams, and made to minutes posted for Feb. 7, 2020 meeting:

Karen Williams provided an overview of regional air quality and program updates the Department of Environmental Quality has been planning. The data from the Portland Metro Ozone levels were reported, showing an upward trend in the 3-year average. *Air toxics were shown in graphs from Portland and La Grande locations in the state, with two examples of toxics commonly associated with transportation and fuel sources.*

Transportation related air quality programs were reviewed. The clean fuels programs had a reduction in 3.6 million tons in greenhouse gases *through 3rd quarter 2019*. Electric vehicle standards and rebates programs have provided \$9 million in rebates *as of January 2020*. *DEQ will start issuing rebates in the Charge Ahead program for low income households*. Other transportation related air quality programs *include grants for clean diesel retrofits and the Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation action, which so far has provided \$2.4 million toward 120 school bus replacements and retrofits.*

Programs *that will help ozone stay within standards* were described, through DEQ Rules, State Government, MPO's and Local Government and Non-Government Organizations. Ms. Williams briefly reviewed the Indirect Source Rule Petition status. An indirect source of air pollution is a land-use activity or development that concentrates emissions from mobile sources such as cars, trucks, construction equipment or locomotives. A common example of an indirect source is a large parking lot. On Dec. 20, 2019, several parties petitioned the Environmental Quality Commission to adopt regulations that would reduce emissions associated with indirect sources.

MOTION: To approve the minutes from February 7, 2020 with corrections included.

Moved: Karen Williams

Seconded: Jeff Owen

ACTION: Motion approved unanimously.

5. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 20-5082 (Ken Lobeck)

Ken Lobeck provided an overview of the March 2020 MTIP Formal Amendment Resolution 20-5082 that includes ODOT moving forward with funds available currently after the STIP rebalancing was completed and draft 2021-24 STIP finished being developed, to start projects six months earlier and help keep on budget:

- Rose Quarter project, adding Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Right-of-Way (ROW) phase
- US26: OR217 to Cornell Road, adding more PE phase funding
- Advancing the phases for six bridge improvement projects
- Advancing and adding two new regional studies

The amendment also includes:

- Adding a new Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant award for TriMet
- Completing a scope change to West Linn's OR43 Arbor Drive to Hidden Springs Rd project

A summary of the 12 projects were given:

ODOT I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project

Action: Add Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Right of Way (ROW) phase funding

ODOT US26: OR217 - Cornell Rd Repaving project

Action: Add funding to PE phase

Multnomah County Morrison St: Willamette River (Morrison) Bridge

Action: Adds \$5 million to construction & advances construction to 2020

ODOT OR99W: Tualatin River NB Bridge

Action: Adds the construction phase and advances it into FY 2020

ODOT US30B: St Johns (Willamette River) Bridge

Action: Add new project (just PE phase) into FY 2020 to start early

ODOT US30: Troutdale (Sandy River Bridge)

Action: Add new project (just PE phase) into FY 2020 to start early

ODOT OR99W: Rock Creek Bridge

Action: Add new project (just PE phase) into FY 2020 to start early

ODOT Hawthorne Bridge Ramp to OR99E (Portland)

Action: Add new project (just PE phase) into FY 2020 to start early

ODOT Portland Metro & Surrounding Area Rockfall Mitigation Study

Action: Add new project study to the MTIP in FY 2020

ODOT Portland Metro Area Bus-On-Shoulder Pilot Study

Action: Add new project study to the MTIP in FY 2020

TriMet TriMet Operator Safety and Rider Awareness

Action: Add new FTA Section 5312 grant award project to MTIP

West Linn OR43: Arbor Drive – Hidden Springs Rd

Action: Complete scope change to the project

Mr. Lobeck noted MPO required certification and compliance requirements had been met with public notification posted. An estimated approval timeline was given. Questions and comments were asked.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig called attention to page 5 of Exhibit A to the resolution that provides information on the scope change with the West Linn project. Elements of the MTIP with funding references to this project are also included with funding through Regional Flexible Funds. The review of the project for part of the selection of project was based on evaluation of project scope and budget. It was suggested that a look back at RFFA projects in Sept. /October be held to review project process changes, approval changes or project delays.

It was noted that Bus-on-Shoulder project is now mentioned in the MTIP, a current amendment to UPWP, and in the next annual UPWP, which shows how different documents work together on projects. Mr. Lobeck noted tracking of funds and changes to projects a good point and would be bringing forward to TPAC more changes on projects for clarity in the future. It was noted lessons learned will help produce better RFFA project process with expectations on types of projects and forecasted possible issues.

- Chris Deffebach reiterated the combined STIP, RFFA and local matching funds that often are given to projects. The awarded size of the project with changes to funding over the course of project planning, development and construction could change project scope and funding over time. It was suggested that with rising costs to projects, bigger projects with bigger impacts might be prioritized. More review on project process for greater value could be evaluated.
- Glen Bolen provided background on how ODOT approached the Bus-on-Shoulder project study, from gathering data to monitoring the system. It was noted that SW Washington and C-Tran already have this project, starting with I-205 and expected expansion for the program on I-5 in September 2020.
- Karen Williams referred to page 5 of the staff report regarding the Rose Quarter project. If understood correctly, staff was recommending the advancement of two phases in the amendment; preliminary engineering (PE) and ROW (Right-of-Way). What was the justification for speeding these phases up? And what are the consequences if not achieving the expectations with the phases? Mr. Lobeck reported the funding is allocation advancement for money already here. In order to finish the PE phase as soon as possible and save on future cost inflation, the staging elements for the project in PE can be applied now.
- Dayna Webb questioned the projects advancing forward regarding dollar amounts and if similar to what was requested previously. Mr. Lobeck noted the estimated costs for phases could possibly be more, or similar. The new STIP showed how costs were underestimated from changed economy, not identifying all requirements in the projects and other factors. The Tables in Exhibit A shows the funds moving from 2020 to 2021.

Ms. Webb asked if all projects being advanced in STIP are part of public comments, what may happen to funds if changed. Mr. Lobeck reported these may not have to be allocated into the next year. The delivery of the project remains the same. A funding cushion has been built for when they become permanent and used in 2021-22. To a question on if more funding than previous predictions in 2018-21 was planned, Mr. Lobeck reported this was an ongoing effort to re-balance funding between projects. We are obligated to use 100% of allocated funds each year.

- Tyler Bullen noted the inclusion of the projects within the overall RTP. But a personal viewpoint is not to vote in favor of the Rose Quarter project, believing this does not meet objectives to reduce congestion and the other goals in the RPT, including climate change factors. It was noted that voting no on the amendment that includes the Rose Quarter project would still align with committee member support of the RTP.
- Gareth Prior noted the comments from Ms. Webb with trying to follow the funds from different sources (RFFA, STIP, and others). It makes a strong case to review later in the year the interactions between changes in projects with budgets, funding, scope changes and processes. A concern was how equity in funded projects was being addressed and impacts to policy goals. Information on these issues was strongly suggested to be given to JPACT.

MOTION: To approve recommendation from staff of projects in Resolution 20-5082 under MTIP Amendment MR20-09-MAR, with the exception of Project 19071 from ODOT, I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project.

Moved: Karen Williams

Seconded: Tyler Bullen

ACTION: Motion had 12 yes votes, 3 no votes, and no abstentions. Motion passed.

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear asked for a point of clarification. Regarding the Rose Quarter project with future decisions yet to be determined, what does this mean for budget authority when there are still decisions to be made? What background information on how JPACT would decide this? Glen Bolen noted one of the biggest issues is timing related to Right-of-Way acquisitions.
- Several committee members suggested adding language to the motion that would be presented to JPACT, which would include this as a controversial project that warranted further discussion, and be listed on the JPACT agenda as a discussion item, not a consent item.

MOTION: To recommend Rose Quarter project discussion with concerns forwarded from TPAC that not all criteria in the RTP have been met with this project. No recommendation of approval of the project.

Moved: Tyler Bullen

Seconded: Karen Williams

Discussion on the motion:

- Katherine Kelly recommended removing the RTP clause in the motion as it already appears in the RTP.
- Mark Lear recommended further discussion at JPACT in light of environmental planning concerns and budget process questions.
- Chris Deffebach recognized the different approaches from the committee but felt the Rose Quarter project should move forward.

ACTION: Motion had 2 yes votes, 13 no votes. Motion failed.

MOTION: TPAC moves forward to JPACT the concerns raised in discussions on Rose Quarter project to ensure conversation at JPACT is held on current budget purposes, environmental planning concerns and project development processes. There is no approval recommendation on the Rose Quarter project in the MTIP amendment. The committee feels these conversations are important for a significant project this size in the region with consequential impacts for future transportation planning.

Moved: Mark Lear

Seconded: Katherine Kelly

ACTION: Motion had 9 yes votes, 4 no votes, and 2 abstentions. Motion passed with divided vote.

This decision will be sent to JPACT with the divided vote and reasons for not making a recommendation at this time regarding the Rose Quarter project. To complete the revised staff report on the amendments the committee was advised to contact Ken Lobeck.

6. Update on Transportation Provisions of Proposed State Climate Legislation (Randy Tucker)

Randy Tucker provided an update for TPAC on transportation provisions related to implementation of climate plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the region. Background on Senate Bill 1530-A with proposed provisions was summarized in the packet material. Following JPACT and Metro Council resolution last winter that called on the legislature to pass climate smart strategies, the legislation worked on the Senate Bill but was slowed in progress reaching final decisions.

When the legislature resumes with possible special session, or by a Governor Executive Order addressing the issue is unknown at this point. It would appear the Executive Order would not approve the Cap and Trade Approach, or generate proceeds from a transportation related auction to the region. The legislature with regional partners will now start from scratch on designing how to implement Climate Smart Strategies moving forward.

Comments from the committee:

- Gareth Prior asked if individual plans from cities and counties was needed beyond the regional planning. Mr. Tucker confirmed local plans are not needed since a metropolitan regional climate smart strategy was already adopted. In the 50/50 split, cities and counties implement their plans. It was noted that the Climate Smart Strategy did not apply to areas outside the Metro boundary area. Counties would need to develop plans for these areas separately. It was noted that jurisdictions had opportunity to develop strategy that would complement legislative efforts, and provide project climate benefit goals for support with the Senate Bill.
- Chris Deffebach noted the lack of climate adaptation in the climate strategy. How can jurisdictions reconcile this not called out in the climate smart strategy with the Senate Bill? Mr. Tucker noted within the urban areas of the state, mitigation is the highest use with this funding. Outside MPOs, it may not be the best use of funding reaching adaptation needs regarding climate strategies. The legislature re-wording on the bill included some language for adaptation, but not with specific clarity. Further work on how allocated funding can be used for climate adaptation would be useful.

7. Regional Congestion Pricing Study – Technical Approach (Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara & Peter Bosa)

Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara and Peter Bosa provided an overview on the technical approach and travel modeling to the Regional Congestion Pricing Study. The study is guided by the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and uses known analysis tools, system performance measures, base networks that have already been modeled for the RTP analysis to test different scenarios with RTP assumptions, and different geographies in the region including those of equity focus areas. The analysis may also apply some off-model tools that have been used to analyze pricing in other parts of the country. The study performance measures were noted as associated with 2018 RTP performance measures with priority of safety, equity, climate change and congestion.

Mr. Bosa reviewed the four-step regional travel forecasting model process being used with the study. Information on how the Metro trip-based travel demand model is created was provided. It was noted that forecasts represent future projections of today’s observed travel behavior using estimates of future land use and transportation networks. A chart was shown of monetary costs of pricing converted to perceived time costs with peak and off-peak periods.

Applying regional pricing in Metro modeling has been used with the Columbia River Crossing project, but as a single-point toll and for revenue maximization. The ODOT Value Pricing project (now called I-5 and I-205 Tolling) is looking at per-link tolls, all lanes/managed lanes, and congestion management/revenue generation. Other applications of pricing with the model include past examinations of VMT tolls, OR-217 on-ramp tolls, Willamette River bridge tolls, and parking cost increases. Mr. Bosa noted the limitations of the model:

- No current roadway pricing in region
- Impacts of pricing are stated, not revealed
- Values of Time established > 10 years ago

- Values of Time may have changed
 - Will be updated with a new study as part of the I-5 and I-205 Tolling project
- The model doesn't explicitly contain income-stratified Values of Time, again something that should be addressed with the ODOT study
- Static assignments in regional model
 - Do not react well to high congestion at facility level (local effects are less accurate than generalized effects)
 - Model best analyzed at regional / sub-regional levels
- Temporal granularity is limited to 1-hour increments
- Model not sensitive to *trips not taken* as a result of a policy change

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear stated that a bike model didn't seem to be included relative to the other travel modes. Showing if new or added bike lanes routes could be added to modeling would be helpful. More on adding this to modeling analysis was noted. Mr. Bosa noted that the Metro travel demand model does, indeed, include a state-of-the-art, first-in-the-nation bike model, and that it will be utilized as part of the Congested Pricing study, as it was in the RTP study.
- Glenn Koehrsen asked if or how generational differences was being included in the data, or done with intuitive data. Mr. Bosa noted the model did provide data on household ages, size of household and income to show differences with impacts, but the willingness to pay for congestion was more difficult to model.

Ms. Mros-O'Hara noted TPACs role with giving feedback on the analysis approach which will help create pricing scenario assumptions. The project team plans to be back in May or June with draft scenario results and findings.

Comments from the committee:

- Jeff Owen noted the goals in the RTP with the goal of tripling walk, bike and transit measures. What in this study will be needed to reach these goals? Ms. Mros-O'Hara noted they are just starting to create scenarios. They plan to run tests and see what moves the needle with mobility and greenhouse emissions, then how this can affect equity and safety. They hope to show strengths of different types of scenarios with concerns, and learn more about them if something is promising. Just now in the exploration stage, with next steps to help us inform congestion planning options.
- Gareth Prior had a red flag concern with this information based on the RTP that did not include tolling information. If adding tolling, the projections change for planning. It was noted there should be discussion on the opportunities found in results of the study. Another red flag was noted regarding hard to discern in regional travel models local roads and arterials a quantitative way to approach pricing when diversion of routes are taken. Mr. Bosa noted the study cautioned against viewing specific intersections for conclusions. With a focus on equity, Mr. Gareth was concerned on the impact to arterial neighborhoods and impacts with diverse populations. It was recommended to gather good data on this for future discussions.
- Karen Williams asked if the study is compatible with GreenStep for calculation of greenhouse emissions. Mr. Bosa noted GreenStep has been used with data collection/evaluation in the past but is not being considered for this project. Instead, all greenhouse emissions analysis will be done using EPA's MOVE tool, which is standard practice for Metro.

- Chris Deffebach suggested jurisdictional and local workshops around the region that could help provide input on parking locations, congested roads, safety measures and more.
- Mark Lear noted how quickly agencies and jurisdictions were moving on this issue. Questions were asked on state travel mode surveys. ODOT has one modeled to calibrate to local conditions following actual people in the region. These cover time periods gathering data on trips taken, travel modes taken and other data. A state activity survey is also planned with similar data gathered.
- Mike Coleman noted the traditional travel model showing home to work and back during peak hours. But travel takes place for a number of other reasons and it would be important for the public to see this far beyond home/work but related to other purposes when discussing pricing or costs to travel. The study is prioritizing four performance measures, but others may give priority to other things such as economic viability, quality of life, and other elements. It was suggested to gain community input on what they feel should be prioritized for this issue.
- Jessica Stetson noted recent short family trips that go beyond the typical work/home travel forecasting. Different travel modes for various purposes, especially with underserved or under-represented populations is important for data collection with this issue. Mr. Coleman added showing time of day with the data is important, also.
- Karen Buehrig supported the workgroup idea that would give jurisdictional discussion for more details. It was appreciated coordination with the City of Portland and ODOT was happening on the project, but suggested more outside jurisdictions was needed for input with coordination. Regarding the four different pricing types with different roadway, arterials, collector roads, state highways and local roadways, how will we know how they differ on the travel model and what those impacts will be? A question on the performance measures on level of safety investments on high injury corridors was noted, and how assessments on funding levels would be studied. A question on completion of projects regarding active transportation systems with focus areas, and how assumptions were planned with investments in these areas.
- Dayna Webb noted that small cities are unable to coordinate with larger entities and be included in travel models. It would benefit larger scope of study to include these areas to show data models and impacts.
- Katherine Kelly suggested simplifying the message. Slide three of the presentation provided the definition of congestion pricing as “the use of a price mechanism (i.e. tolls, parking fees) to alert drivers to external costs of their trip”, which can be the goal of the program. Slides four and eight could come together that start with the purpose, how to approach, apply performance measures and form objectives. The project goals should help us reach outcomes which apply to goals in the RTP and how we will measure these in the end. It was suggested to clarify what is meant by including all capital projects in the 2021-2024 MTIP regarding parking (slide 5 of the presentation regarding pricing scenarios – conceptual. Ms. Kelly agreed that a small working group can help look at the layers with the study.
- Mark Lear asked if there were ways to look at TNCs (like Uber and Lyft) in the model, what we know currently and what might be emerging.
- Elizabeth Mros-O’Hara said she will be reaching out to TPAC members to get more input on how we develop scenarios and to make sure to address their concerns in the technical analysis. Members should expect to hear from her in the near future.

8. Jurisdictional Transfer Functional Classification Recommendations (John Mermin & Kirsten Pennington)

John Mermin provided an overview of the project and emphasized that the functional classification recommendations are providing new technical information to inform future policy work that would come during the next Oregon Highway Plan and RTP updates. Kirsten Pennington shared the project timeline and the roadway functional classification recommendations. It was noted any that changes to the Oregon Highway plan would require Oregon Transportation Commission amendment process and approval. Changes in classifications can affect roadway designs, mobility standards, access management standards, maintenance investment levels, and reflect a function that lends itself to a future jurisdictional transfer.

Comments from the committee:

- Glen Bolen noted that new classifications could help facilitate roadway designs that better alignment will the current function of the roadway.
- Garet Prior noted a concern with the recommended change in classification of 99W and whether that meant it was assumed that a future transfer would occur. He noted that the city of Tualatin does not want to own 99W, thus Washington County would need to be the owner if a transfer occurred.

9. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Draft Review (John Mermin)

John Mermin provided TPAC a summary of feedback received on the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) at the Feb. 19 federal and state consultation meeting. The staff noted streamlined narratives with shorter, plain language, a reorganized document with simpler summary budget table, and tied to the four Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); equity, safety, climate and congestion. In addition, the new UPWP will have the threshold for required legislative amendments raised to \$500,000 with a tightened timeline (requests for legislative amendments must be submitted by the end of each calendar year (end of the 2nd quarter of the fiscal year)), and provides a definition of planning vs project development (to help distinguish what projects need to be in the UPWP (planning) vs the MTIP (project development)).

Summary of feedback from 2/19 Federal & State Consultation

- Positive feedback for the shorter streamlined document
- New narrative submitted from ODOT for Bus on Shoulder pilot project
- Ensure references to State & Federal air quality status and MPO are consistently described
- Revise to ensure that MAP-21 performance measurement is referenced where applicable
- Create a separate narrative for the Travel Behavior survey, expand description of VisionEval model
- Reference tasks addressing outstanding federal corrective actions
- Refinements to summary budget table pending USDOT & ODOT conversation

TPAC will receive a track-change version of the draft UPWP prior to the April 3 meeting.

Comments from the committee:

- Mike Coleman asked what the reasoning was for the proposed higher funding level with required amendments. Chairman Kloster noted the confusion this had raised at JPACT when project scopes or status were changed in a number of projects.

- Karen Buehrig noted the Clackamas County is working to complete information on the Oak Grove-Lake Oswego Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Feasibility Study project on page 87 of the UPWP. They are looking for further connections with the project and have funds for additional work so will be broadening the study scope. Track changes with this information will be included in the next draft of the document for review.
- Regarding the funding table at the back of the document, it was suggested to describe why not all projects are described here. Regarding the Regional Transit Planning Strategy project, it was suggested to name this Regional Transit Plan Implementation Strategy to reflect the implementation of the project.
- Glen Bolen acknowledge the work on the new version of the document with streamlining, readability and improved templates to follow.
- Chris Deffebach noted the reference to STIP funding allocations on page 30, Regional Transit Planning Strategy. It was felt Metro did not have a role with this. Clarifying the UPWP is for federal funding only, it was asked by ODOT Development Review was included in the document. Counties also hold development review but do not provide this for the UPWP.
- Chairman Kloster noted that some local projects with regional impact were relevant to include in the UPWP.
- Jessica Berry noted the disconnect between HB2017 transportation funding and federal planning funding with the UPWP.
- Karen Buehrig suggested for next year's UPWP to note any projects that go beyond one fiscal year and share the total project costs associated with them as a footnote to the budget table for the project.

10. Committee Feedback on Creating a Safe Space at TPAC

Chairman Kloster read the comments from the committee on feedback and suggestions for safe space at TPAC meetings.

- Taking "secret" pictures of other TPAC members, even as a joke between friends for texting, creates mistrust with those of marginalized communities. Unsure the intent, but be obvious or don't do it. It's uncomfortable.
- Possibly have recorder read back the motion as made, and then pause for people to make sure they understand. Moving motions more slowly.
- 10 points for John Mermin's presentation slide, which quickly explained the UPWP.
- 10 points for Karen Buehrig's diligence in reading through, and to the UPWP Appendix. You are greatly appreciated.

11. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kloster at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, March 6, 2020

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	03/06/2020	03/06/2020 TPAC Agenda	030620T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	02/25/2020	TPAC Work Program, as of 02/25/2020	030620T-02
3	Memo	02/27/2020	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: March 2020 TPAC MTIP Monthly Submitted Amendments	030620T-03
4	Memo	02/27/2020	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: Fatal crash update	030620T-04
5	Handout	02/27/2020	Article from Oregonian: Pedestrian traffic deaths spike to highest level since 1988 last year, report finds	030620T-05
6	Memo	02/28/2020	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Administrative amendment to the 2019-20 UPWP	030620T-06
7	Draft Minutes	02/07/2020	Draft minutes of TPAC 02/07/2020 meeting	030620T-07
8	Resolution 20-5082	03/06/2020	Resolution 20-5082 for the purpose of adding, amending existing, or advancing future projects to the 2018-21 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program which involves the advancement of specific project phases for ten ODOT 2021-24 draft STIP projects, adding a new TriMet project and completing a major scope change to West Linn's OR43 project (MR20-09-MAR)	030620T-08
9	Exhibit A to Resolution 20-5082	03/06/2020	Exhibit A to Resolution 20-5082, 2018-21 MTIP	030620T-09
10	Staff Report	02/27/2020	Staff Report to Resolution 20-5082, 2018-21 MTIP	030620T-10
11	Handout	03/06/2020	Senate Bill 1530-A; Summary of provisions related to implementation of metropolitan climate plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation	030620T-11
12	Memo	03/06/2020	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Metro, Elizabeth Mros-O'Hara, Metro RE: Regional Congestion Pricing Study, Technical Approach and Methods	030620T-12
13	Handout	Feb. 2020	2021-2024 MTIP Performance Assessment, Equity Focus Areas Map	030620T-13
14	Handout	N/A	Regional Congestion Pricing Study work plan, at-a-glance	030620T-14

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
15	Handout	Jan. 2020	Metro Highway Jurisdictional Transfer Framework; Oregon Highway Plan Roadway Classification Change Recommendations - draft	030620T-15
16	Handout	Dec. 2019	Regional framework for highway jurisdictional transfer	030620T-16
17	Memo	02/28/20	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner RE: 2019-20 UPWP Discussion Draft	030620T-17
18	Handout	Feb. 2020	Jurisdictional Transfer Framework Project Schedule	030620T-18
19	Handout	N/A	Oregon Highway Plan Roadway Classification Change Recommendation Map	030620T-19
20	Presentation	03/06/20	March 2020 MTIP Formal Amendment Summary; Resolution 20-5082	030620T-20
21	Presentation	03/06/20	Regional Congestion Pricing Study	030620T-21
22	Presentation	03/06/20	Regional Framework for Highway Jurisdictional Transfer	030620T-22
23	Presentation	03/06/20	2020-21 Unified Planning Work Program	030620T-23