

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday, July 8, 2022 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Don Odermott
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Laurie Lebowsky
Lewis Lem
Idris Ibrahim

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Jessica Berry
Sarah Paulus
Erin Wardell
Jennifer Campos
Peter Hurley
Dayna Webb
Chris Strong

Affiliate

Multnomah County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County

Members Excused

Jay Higgins
Karen Williams
Jasmine Harris
Katherine Kelly
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Rich Doenges

Affiliate

City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver, WA
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Brad Choi
Camilla Dartnell

Affiliate

City of Hillsboro
Kittelson & Associates

Guests attending, (continued)

Cindy Dauer	Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Cody Field	City of Tualatin
Jean Senechal-Biggs	City of Beaverton
Mike McCarthy	City of Tualatin
Will Farley	City of Lake Oswego
Emily Cline	Federal Highway Administration
Dave Aulwes	TriMet
Jim Sjulín	40-Mile Loop
Kadin Mangalik	
Megan Neill	Multnomah County
Peter Swinton	Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District
Shane Phelps	Parametrix
Steven Drahota	HDR, Inc.
Valerie Egon	Oregon Department of Transportation
One unidentified caller	

Metro Staff Attending

Ted Leybold, Resource & Dev. Manager	John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner	Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner
Ken Lobeck, Senior Transportation Planner	Eliot Rose, Transportation Tech & Analyst
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Noel Mickelberry, Associate Planner	Cindy Pederson, Research Center Manager
Lake McTighe, Regional Transportation Planner	Chris Johnson, Research Center Manager
Kate Hawkins, Senior Transportation Planner	Matt Bihn, Principal Transportation Planner
Matthew Hampton, Senior Transportation Planner	Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Robert Spurlock, Senior Transportation Planner	Marne Duke, Senior Regional Planner
Matthew Flodin, PD&R Intern	Miranda Seekins, PD&R Intern
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder	

Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Committee members, member alternates, guests, public and staff were noted as attending. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. Input was encouraged for providing safe space for everyone at the meeting via the link in chat. Comments would be shared at the end of the meeting.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

• **Updates from committee members and around the Region**

Chris Ford announced the new Region 1 Planning Manager has been hired at ODOT. This position works with long-range program planning, grants and development reviews. The full announcement with name will be shared at the August TPAC meeting.

It was announced that Talena Adams has left ODOT and moved to a position with Western Federal Lands. Her position was Program and Funding Manager with work related to MTIP and STIP agreements. The posting to fill this position will be made soon.

An ODOT colleague passed away recently, Diana Wade, who many knew working in procurement and agreements. Sympathies were noted to her family and co-workers.

Eric Hesse announced a new bridge opening in the City of Portland, The Blumenauer Bridge that cross I-84. July 31 is the celebration kickoff with events planned.

<https://www.portland.gov/transportation/news/2022/6/8/save-date-pbot-opens-blumenauer-bridge-july-31-opening-celebration> A manager position opening was also noted in the department with outreach for interest shared.

Chair Kloster announced that former Director of the Metro Planning, Development and Research Center Department, Elissa Gertler, has taken the position of Director at NW Oregon Housing Authority. A national recruitment search is underway for her successor. In the interim, Andy Shaw, Metro Government Relations Director is serving as the department's Director.

Tara O'Brien announced that additional service cuts due to historical operator shortages are planned with TriMet. They are putting many resources into hiring efforts, but challenged to keep up with current service levels. A link in the chat was shared about the changes planned in September and work toward service restoration in the new year:

<https://news.trimet.org/2022/06/trimet-to-temporarily-reduce-service-levels-this-fall-due-to-historic-operator-shortage/>

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Chair Kloster referred to the memo in the packet provided by Ken Lobeck on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during June 2022. For any questions on the monthly MTIP amendment projects you may contact Mr. Lobeck directly.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The monthly update on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties in 2022 was provided. In June, six people died in traffic crashes in in the region. Five in Multnomah County, one in Clackamas County and one in Washington County. So far this year, 57 people have been killed in traffic crashes, an average of 3 people every day. Nearly half of the traffic deaths (25) have been people walking or in a wheelchair.

Chair Kloster noted concern with regulated electric unicycles and how this mode of travel would affect safety on roads. Robert Spurlock noted if we can make our system safe for bicycles and e-bikes, I think it's safe to assume that it will be safe for e-unicycles, too. Ms. McTighe added Metro is working with regional partners to apply for a Safe Streets for All funding grant, as are jurisdictions.

- **Regional Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) Program Project Solicitation update** (Caleb Winter) Mr. Winter presented a draft timeline for project solicitation in the application process. In July project solicitation begins. Applications are due the end of September when evaluations begin on project applications. Recommendations are expected to be presented to TPAC in January 2023. Following necessary MTIP amendments, IGAs and procurements, the first month available to fund a project is October 2023.

Chris Deffebach asked is the process the same - in terms of transport members being the ones that submit applications. Mr. Winter noted projects can be originated by cities, counties, ODOT, TriMet, SMART and other public agencies working in the region like PSU. We are considering ways to be more inclusive and working adding flexibility with the knowledge that each project will need to be led by a certified agency to administer the federal funds.

- **Regional Mobility Policy Practitioner Forum update** (Kim Ellis) It was announced the planned July Practitioner Forum was not able to be arranged, but will be presented at the August 17 MTAC/TPAC workshop with other practitioners invited that have participated in previous forums. The project team is working on updating materials based on feedback from meetings. For further information contacting Ms. Ellis and Glen Bolen was encouraged.
- **Summary of housekeeping changes to the RTP network maps** (John Mermin) The memo in the packet reported on recommended changes to the RTP network maps. At the June TPAC meeting, local jurisdictions were asked to review the RTP maps and identify any proposed changes based on local plans completed since the adoption of the 2018 RTP.

These changes are considered “housekeeping” changes to ensure consistency between local plans and the RTP. Proposed changes should be based on adopted local Transportation System Plans (TSP), Comprehensive plans, Corridor or Area plans, and be consistent with RTP network classifications. At the end of the memo (beginning on p.29) there are tables showing requested changes that are not recommended by Metro staff, along with a rationale. Please contact the staff listed above if you have questions about any of the map changes or identify any further housekeeping changes later in the RTP update process.

The maps were located via this link:

<https://drcmetro.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=9057331682354a188ec2688071239f> It was noted these are the maps in the adopted 2018 RTP, and do not show the proposed changes.

Chris Ford noted that if any substantial changes are removed, please check with ODOT so that amendments based on proposed plans are not compromised with TPR planning.

Public Communications on Agenda Items

Jim Sjulín, 40-mile loop land trust

Mr. Sjulín submitted a public comment letter on behalf of the 40-Mile Loop Land Trust that endorses funding of 6 projects under consideration in the RFFA/Trails Bond grant applications. All of the following projects build on past successes and are aimed directly at Metro’s desire to make nature accessible to communities of color and to people with lower incomes. All of the projects help make over 5,000 acres of public natural areas and open space located in the Columbia River floodplain more accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists in residential areas adjacent to the floodplain. These 6 projects also provide critical linkages between residential areas and 60,000 jobs in floodplain employment centers.

It was noted the letter was added to the packet, and added to the public comment submissions.

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from June 3, 2022

MOTION: To approve minutes from June 3, 2022.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Tara O’Brien

ACTION: Motion passed with one abstention; Chris Ford.

Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA)/Trails Bond: Risk Assessment, Public Comment reports

(Dan Kaempff & Robert Spurlock, Metro) The purpose of the presentation was reported to clarify TPAC role, process and timeline for developing funding recommendations, understand materials and information; review updates, and input to inform July 14 workshop.

Since the initial draft Outcomes Evaluation report was released, a number of projects have had increases to their requested funding amounts. These increases are resulting from further budget analysis as part of the project Risk Assessment work. These costs are reflected in the updated Outcomes Evaluation report and the project funding examples worksheets included with materials.

Several applicants have provided additional project information to help better understand project details and other aspects not fully brought out in the Outcomes Evaluation. This information has been added to the relevant projects in the Outcomes Evaluation report. Several more applicants have indicated they will submit updated information for the Outcomes Evaluation report. This additional information will be available in the materials for the July 14 TPAC workshop.

The 29 applications received were shown by funding category, amount requested and sub region. The process for project selection between RFFA and Trails Bond was shown. Upcoming TPAC meetings and schedule leading to Metro Council adoption in October was shown.

Camilla Dartnell provided information on the Risk Assessment Overview.

Evaluation based on:

- Risks associated with inadequate scope, schedule, budget, or collaboration
- Risks associated with inherent project complexities

Evaluation considers:

- Different funding types (RFFA vs Trails Bond)
- Project development phases: completed vs requesting funding
- Projects requesting planning funds not penalized for not being far in project development:
 - evaluation criteria applied is specific to project funding stage
 - Projects requesting construction funds are expected to have more detailed understanding of risks and cost estimate

Mr. Kaempff noted that the public comment report included an online, multi-lingual survey between May 20 – June 21 with over 1,550 responses, plus letters, email, etc. It includes detail by project, zip code, other demographics, and is used to help decision-makers understand level of public support and additional project benefits.

The funding package examples:

- 1 & 2. Overall: All criteria weighted equally
3. Construction: Focus on project completion
4. Project Development: Focus on project pipeline
5. Specific Outcomes: Advancing a specific criteria area(s)
6. Other Considerations: Additional factors that will impact proposed funding packages

Comments from the committee:

- Jaimie Lorenzini noted in reference to the Fanno Creek calculation adjustment if this is something other applicants should be checking on as well. Mr. Kaempff the error was noted from one excel spreadsheet transfer to another. Other errors are not expected by applicants are encouraged to report any if found.

- Karen Buehrig noted that as we prepare for the workshop next week, it would be helpful to have an example what it would look like to incorporate new information specific to investments around the region. It was suggested to add a column in the spreadsheet for process objectives as it is important to articulate how projects are achieving the process objectives.
- Chris Deffebach noted that applicants would likely be advocating for their projects at the workshop. It was suggested to provide guidelines on sticking to key points on the projects that we need to know about, and using this as an opportunity to learn about the needs across the region. Asked if public comments would be accepted at the workshop, Mr. Kaempff confirmed, and added that much of the information from applicants have already been gathered. The discussion at the workshop is for TPAC is to help start making some choices about which projects will be recommended or not.
- Chris Ford noted the importance of the ability to get projects delivered. It was encouraged to be working with local agencies especially now with project cost escalations. It was noted that if something doesn't get built in this cycle the costs may prevent projects from moving forward with cost increases.
- Eric Hesse appreciated the comments. It was noted the process deliberation and delivery assessment can help get to the objectives. This can be used to support project development and show how cost increases affect the project delivery. It was asked when the reports from the coordinating committees would be available. Mr. Kaempff noted he planned to send them out early the next week.

Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials (John Mermin & Lake McTighe, Metro) Mr. Mermin began the presentation by reviewing what the Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials policy brief is; Similar to background reports developed in previous RTP updates, Informational document that provides a mix of existing conditions, existing RTP policy, relevant work, and policy considerations for further discussion, Support JPACT and Metro Council discussions to provide staff with policy direction, and Informs future phases of the RTP – Needs assessment, Call for Projects, Chapter 8 Implementation of RTP.

The review process for the policy brief was given. Changes since TPAC reviewed the draft policy brief in March include clarified and strengthened language throughout the policy brief, better acknowledged the past efforts to address urban arterials, and reframed Section 4 “What’s needed to move Forward” to present Policy Questions rather than Recommended Actions and focused them more explicitly on the 2023 RTP update.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Ford thought that at large, too many policy and priority projects are being presented by Metro with the RTP and not sure this is one that is necessary given other agency and community efforts. There is concern with the map that does not work for showing investment in minor arterials where people work and live that is more relevant. Since others are trying to direct duplicate work in the region, there is concern on how this will be implemented in connection with other regional priorities.

Mr. Mermin noted a lot of priority areas have been put forward with the project. They are following policy direction that came from early outreach from stakeholders. Mr. Leybold agreed that a lot of direction on arterials has been received for attention the last two years. Efforts to frame this for incorporation in the RTP itself, with documentation there as part of the overall RTP policy is the goal. Ms. McTighe added this is asking questions on what can be done

in the RTP organizing documents on these urban arterials that are a major safety issue. This is building on the policies already in the RTP on making better coordination with challenges to safety and equity on roadways.

- Karen Buehrig noted how wonderful it was seeing the evolution of the document with added inputs. It was asked how the document would be used. It was suggested that it would be useful when searching for new funding. There is concern with arterial descriptions not fitting major arterials with data on safety and equity. It was suggested to look at coordination with the 2040 Growth Concept for guidance with similar urban arterials in corridors listed. It was asked that TPAC have specific questions planned to ask JPACT at their August meeting. The number of policy questions in Table 2 are extensive and not enough time will be available to get through them.
- Eric Hesse noted the purpose with the background is to illustrate the context of the issues, noting the priorities and how we can incorporate some of them into the RTP while developing further issues that address safety and equity.
- Chris Deffebach appreciated the early draft presented. It was noted that urban arterials listed do not always match regional priorities with investments. It may be premature to reach conclusions without investment identified. It was suggested to have a discussion on possible tradeoffs, with Chapter 4 NEPA assessment in mind. It was asked what was expected to come from the JPACT/RTP workshop on this topic.
- Don Odermott noted that the crash data presented each meeting, areas in the region with old infrastructure on unregulated access, and rural areas which are out of the purview of Metro boundaries have a large number of these fatalities. Local jurisdictions are looking at these issues on urban arterials, but are not always in the same spot per status moving forward across the region.
- Tara O'Brien felt that Table 2 placed us going in the right direction. There was a question on where we were going with this in the RTP. It seemed we transitioned from prioritized to emphasized, and are trying to understand if these are some chapter 8 studies, or change in how projects are considered. Ms. McTighe noted they are asking TPAC what should be asked at the JPACT/RTP workshop. Some centralized questions have been presented but the project team is interested in hearing further thoughts.
- Allison Boyd agreed with past comments. There is a need to evaluate how we are addressing safety on arterials and what more we can do. It was important to check out new funding sources with so many arterials and limited funding. It was suggested to step back from a narrow frame of focus on our major arterials so that it doesn't cloud the report and provide a clearer criteria perspective on equity and safety issues, and use some of the tools we are already using in developing RTP policies.
- Chris Ford noted that Ms. McTighe's comments helped clarify where we are going with this. It was suggested a request for possible tradeoffs and ideas on where the highest safety challenges on major arterials could be identified be sent to TPAC. There was concern the JPACT/RTP workshop in August would not be well attended due to vacations and calendar conflicts. It was suggested another TPAC workshop on just this issue be scheduled.

Chair Kloster suggested the Mr. Mermin and Ms. McTighe provided a "comment from the chair" update at the TPAC August 5 meeting that would preview their presentation to JPACT/RTP workshop, starting with concerns of limited funds for all these arterials. Further feedback on the questions for JPACT is encouraged to be sent to the project team.

Enhanced Transit Concepts/Better Bus update (Matt Bihn, Metro, David Aulwes, TriMet) Mr. Bihn began the presentation with a reminder that Enhanced Transit Concepts (ETC) is a data-driven approach to planning and designing transit priority projects. It has partnerships between Metro, TriMet, and local jurisdictions to help make bus travel more effective and more attractive. Every day, 60% of the region’s transit trips are by bus. Enhanced transit on key corridors makes transit more convenient. This increases ridership and helps us meet our climate and equity goals.

Four purposes of the program include:

Reliability. People want to be on time to work and appointments. Reliability means the bus arrives on schedule, day after day.

Speed. Transit priority treatments can make transit trips faster, better serving today’s riders and attracting new riders.

Comfort. A comfortable and safe travel experience from door-to-door makes transit a stress-free option.

Convenience. Service design can make the bus a convenient option.

A map showing where bus delays are occurring with impact to travel was provided. In 2018, Metro, in partnership with TriMet, unveiled its Regional Enhanced Transit Corridors pilot program. Metro solicited applications from jurisdictions throughout the region and allocated \$5 million to this initial draft of projects. From 2018 to 2022, hundreds of projects were studied and designed, and more than 50 have been implemented. Metro and TriMet will continue investing in enhanced transit projects through what has now been branded their “Better Bus” program.

The City of Portland launched its own set of enhanced transit projects through two initial planning and design studies:

– The Enhanced Transit Corridors (ETC) plan identified transit priority treatments applicable to Portland and a set of corridors to apply these treatments.

–Central City in Motion (CCIM) was a planning effort that resulted in 18 projects in the Central City improving the walking, bicycling, and transit environment.

Today, the City of Portland has two programs focused on enhanced transit:

–Rose Lanes are corridors with high delay and high ridership. These are corridors for ongoing investment.

– The Transit Priority Spot Improvement program funds tactical improvements at intersections or short segments. These projects are generally low-cost and can be implemented quickly.

Maps were shown where projects have been studied, projects implemented, and where advancement with equity has been made. Achievements with the project include three major projects that tackled high-delay areas through the Enhanced Transit Corridors program. Multiple bus lines cross the river via the Steel, Burnside, and Hawthorne Bridges. Bus lanes on and approaching these bridges made rush hour faster for thousands of daily riders.

What’s next? Agencies and jurisdictions continue to invest in transit projects both under the Enhanced Transit Corridors banner as well as through larger regional partnerships. Portland’s first Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line is currently under construction. Branded as FX, this bus rapid transit service will operate on Division Street from Downtown Portland to Downtown Gresham. Service opens September 2022. Metro, TriMet, and local jurisdictions have undertaken study of two additional transit corridors with critical safety, mobility, and community needs; 82nd Avenue, and TV Highway.

The Better Bus program is the next generation of ETC, with a new funding stream, updated criteria, update to pipeline of projects, and will include funding of construction. Stronger focus on geographic distribution and on equity will integrate transit priority treatments where local capital projects already planned (CIP), and identify project in areas with high densities of equity populations or areas where bus lines with high proportions of equity population riders. The presentation ended with a question to the committee on how might Better Bus projects be incorporated into your jurisdiction's projects?

Comments from the committee:

- Eric Hesse noted it was exciting to see improvements on the ground, and asked if more materials from past programming with ETC were available to help with the process moving forward. Mr. Bihn noted they are just ramping up on this but everyone is working on multiple projects. The IGA is now being signed with hiring the consulting team.
- Chris Deffebach noted that small projects make a big difference, and these incremental improvements with bus systems were welcome. Washington County is completing their County-wide transit study so this is good timing for jurisdictions and county coordination, working with Metro and TriMet.
- Karen Buehrig recommended a look at the 2040 STIP, with the draft list just released, that can be integrated with ETC investments at the same time other work is being done, such as McLoughlin Blvd. projects. They would both benefit.
- Tara O'Brien asked how this integrates into the High Capacity Transit Strategy update. TriMet is looking to add future BRT corridors and hope to see alignment in connections. Mr. Bihn noted HCT is still coming online and see this as a higher level investment discussion. Some project construction has started with BRT projects put more plans are yet to start. There are designs and improvement projects on the books now underway. Identifying BRT corridors will be important in the future.

Multnomah County Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge Update (Alex Oreschak, Metro/Megan Neill, Multnomah County/Shane Phelps, Parametrix) Ms. Neill began the presentation by providing an overview of the project. The primary purpose of the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge (EQRB) Project is to create a seismically resilient Burnside Street lifeline crossing of the Willamette River that would remain fully operational and accessible for vehicles and other modes of transportation immediately following a major Cascadia Subduction Zone (CSZ) earthquake.

The adopted 2018 RTP's financially constrained project list includes Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the EQRB Project, which reflect planning and project development activities, including planning required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, project design and right-of-way acquisition. Additionally, the adopted 2018 RTP's strategic project list, which identifies additional priority projects the region would pursue if more funding becomes available, includes the EQRB Project's Phase 3, reflecting the construction phase of the project.

Over 100 options were studied during the EQRB Project's Feasibility Study Phase (2016-2018), including tunnels, ferries, a fixed bridge, and other bridge alignments. From that study, four bridge alternatives were recommended for further study in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Replacement Long Span alternative was recommended by the Community Task Force and Policy Group in late fall 2020. Responses from an online public survey showed 88% support for the recommendation. On February 5th, 2021, the County published a Draft Environmental Impact Statement that included the recommended Preferred Alternative followed by a 45-day public comment period.

Following publication of the Draft EIS, the County asked the project team to identify ways to bring the overall cost of the project down, while maintaining the core purpose and need of the project, in order to help ensure a new bridge is funded and built. Any significant changes to the project as a result would be documented in Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement and published for public review and comment. Over the course of the summer of 2021, the project team worked to identify a range of cost saving measures and presented them to the Community Task Force in October 2021.

The range of cost saving measures included the selection of a conventional girder style structure type for the west approach span over Tom McCall Waterfront Park, a bascule style structure type for the movable span in the river, and the narrowing of the overall bridge width resulting in the reduction of one vehicular lane of traffic. The Community Task Force then provided a preliminary approval of the range of cost saving measures, subject to hearing feedback from the public on the changes being proposed.

After reviewing the results from the public outreach campaign conducted in late fall of 2021, the Community Task Force voted by majority on January 24th, 2022 to recommend that the cost saving measures be adopted as part of an updated recommended Preferred Alternative. On March 3rd, 2022 the Policy Group of the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge Project approved the recommendation put forth by the Community Task Force. The Board of County Commissioners approved the refined recommended Preferred Alternative on March 17th, 2022. Subsequently, the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement was published on April 29th, 2022, followed by a 45-day public comment period.

In July 2022, the Portland City Council will consider a resolution to adopt the recommended Preferred Alternative. Multnomah County and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) anticipate publishing a Final EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) for the EQRB Project in late 2022. Metro and Multnomah County staff are coordinating with FHWA to determine the appropriate timeline and actions that will allow the Project to demonstrate fiscal constraint and for FHWA to issue a ROD for the Project. Issuance of the ROD will allow Multnomah County to advance the Project into the Design Phase. The Project will return to TPAC, JPACT, and Metro Council in the coming months with additional updates.

Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC (Chair Kloster) – Comments received:

Could Tom review the status and timing of new TPAC reps being seated?

Chair Kloster provided a short update on the planned recruitment for six new community members to TPAC, coming from community based organizations. Details on these plans will be provided at the August TPAC meeting. Chris Ford noted that once the new community members are appointed a special session could be offered to help acquaint them with agency and jurisdictions, and committee processes with projects.

Can we have an update on the previous request of whether TPAC materials might be able to be linked like JPACT materials in packets?

An answer to this question would be addressed at the next TPAC meeting.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, July 8, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	7/8/2022	7/8/2022 TPAC Agenda	070822T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	6/30/2022	TPAC Work Program as of 6/30/2022	070822T-02
3	Memo	6/30/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (during June 2022)	070822T-03
4	Memo	7/1/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Planner RE: June 2022 Report - Traffic Deaths in the three counties	070822T-04
5	Memo	7/1/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Metro RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Summary of “housekeeping” changes to the RTP network Maps	070822T-05
6	Draft Minutes	6/3/2022	Draft Minutes from TPAC June 3, 2022 meeting	070822T-06
7	Memo	7/1/2022	To: TPAC and interested parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Development of Regional Flexible Funds/Trails Bond Funding Options	070822T-07
8	Report	7/1/2022	Regional Funding Allocation: Outcomes Evaluation Report 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Parks & Nature Trails Bond funding	070822T-08
9	Links to spreadsheets	N/A	Links to excel spreadsheets for RFFA tech scores and Bond examples	070822T-09
10	Memo	7/1/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, and Lake McTighe, Metro RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) –Draft Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials policy brief	070822T-10
11	Report	June 29, 2022	Draft 2023 RTP policy brief Safe and healthy urban arterials	070822T-11
12	Memo	7/8/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Alex Oreschak, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Multnomah County Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge Update	070822T-12
13	Handout	N/A	Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge Fact Sheet	070822T-13
14	Slide	7/8/2022	June traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	070822T-14

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
15	Slide	7/8/2022	Metro 2021 TSMO Strategy Project Solicitation Draft Timeline	070822T-15
16	Public comment letter	July 7, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Laura "Lou" Reynoldson, President 40 Mile Loop Land Trust RE: Metro Bond for Trails & Regional Flexible Fund Allocation	070822T-16
17	Memo	July 1, 2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties FROM: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Development of Regional Flexible Funds/Trails Bond Funding Options	070822T-17
18	Report	July 5, 2022	Regional Funding Allocation: Outcomes Evaluation Report 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Parks & Nature Trails Bond funding	070822T-18
19	Links to spreadsheets	July 8, 2022	Links to excel spreadsheets RFFA Technical Scores on projects and Bond examples	070822T-19
20	Presentation	July 8, 2022	Developing funding recommendations for 2025-2027 Regional Funding: RFFA + Trails Bond	070822T-20
21	Presentation	July 8, 2022	Safe and Healthy Urban Arterials – 2023 RTP Policy Brief	070822T-21
22	Presentation	July 8, 2022	ENHANCED TRANSIT CONCEPTS / BETTER BUS PROGRAM	070822T-22
23	Presentation	July 8, 2022	Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge	070822T-23