

# Meeting minutes



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

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

Date/time: Friday July 7, 2023 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

---

## **Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Allison Boyd  
Dyami Valentine  
Judith Perez  
Eric Hesse  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Jay Higgins  
Mike McCarthy  
Tara O'Brien  
Chris Ford  
Gerik Kransky  
Laurie Lebowsky-Young  
Bill Beamer  
Sarah Iannarone  
Danielle Maillard  
Jasia Mosley  
Indi Namkoong  
Katherine Kelly

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Portland  
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Community member at large  
The Steet Trust  
Oregon Walks  
Community member at large  
Verde  
City of Vancouver

## **Alternates Attending**

Dayna Webb  
Will Farley  
Gregg Snyder  
Glen Bolen

## **Affiliate**

City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation

## **Members Excused**

Lewis Lem  
Ellie Gluhosky  
Jasmine Harris  
Steve Gallup  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Ned Conroy  
Rian Sallee

## **Affiliate**

Port of Portland  
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon  
Federal Highway Administration  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

## **Guests Attending**

Cody Field  
Frank Stevens

## **Affiliate**

City of Tualatin

---

Jacqui Treiger	Oregon Environmental Council
Jean Senechal Biggs	City of Beaverton
Jeff Owen	HRD
Josh Channell	WSP
Kirsten Beale	WSP
Mike Mason	Oregon Department of Transportation
Nick Fortey	Federal Highway Administration
Rachel Haukkala	WSP
Sara Wright	
Stephanie Millar	Oregon Department of Transportation
Vanessa Vissar	Oregon Department of Transportation

**Metro Staff Attending**

Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Daniel Audelo, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, John Mermin, Kate Hawkins, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matt Bihn, Monica Krueger, Summer Blackhorse, Ted Leybold, Thaya Patton, Tom Kloster.

**Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions**

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. 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**

- Laurie Lebowsky-Young announced that US Department of Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg would be in Washougal that morning for the dedication of the 32<sup>nd</sup> Street underpass project.
- Sarah Iannarone noted the visit from Secretary Buttigieg at 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue later today. Ms. Iannarone shared feedback from community members that have been asked to provide input on Metro projects and programs through the RTP engagement process. While informational sessions and workshops have been appreciated multiple organizations have lost interest from holding space for their feedback from the black community and exhausted from constantly asked to participate. There is a lack of trust between our organizations and state systems when there are truly not changes that reflect our feedback or priorities. Metro’s community groups need to move at the speed of trust. They cannot start with transactional approaches but earn trust with the black community first. Metro is encouraged to move beyond feedback given to implementing action policies and decision making with funding.
- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted from late May 2023 through late June 2023. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Chair Kloster) The monthly fatal crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was provided. There have been at least 13 traffic fatalities since the May fatal crash report. There have been at least 64 fatalities in the three counties since the start of the year, and 260 in Oregon.



Briefly, the 2024-27 STIP program funding categories were reviewed. Funding priority policy direction utilizes considerations when setting priorities and making decisions to balance how needs are addressed across all tiers. Funding scenarios focus areas highlighted were maintenance on critical assets, key corridors, and lifeline routes, safety addressing fatalities and serious crashes, multimodal with critical connections in high-need locations, and timely investments such as transportation electrification.

It was noted the 2027-30 STIP will be limited in funding due to:

- Rising costs
- HB 2017 named projects will be nearing completion
- Federal infrastructure bill expires in 2026
- State Highway Fund revenues are flat
- Funds shifted from the STIP to cover ODOT's operations and maintenance shortfall
- ADA commitment

It is expected there will be 25% lower funding available this cycle.

Comments from the committee:

- Chair Kloster asked where current projects in the current MTIP aren't completed before the new cycle begins are placed. Mr. Ford noted these can be amended into the MTIP up to the September 2024 deadline. It was asked how revenue could be spent beyond the 2027 projection (slide named State Highway Fund Cash Balance) if the balance is 0? Mr. Ford noted federal dollars can be moved and shifted to reflect changing program scope and budgets but are limited per any required Federal program funded. It was noted the draft STIP lists \$300m unallocated funds which could be used for revenue shortfalls.
- Eric Hesse asked if the ADA program scenario included the additional allocation in the 27-30 base STIP. Mr. Ford noted after the 24-27 STIP there will need to be some discussion for additional funds that will come over time from this starting point. Mr. Hesse noted it's helpful seeing the projected funds already accounted for and where discretionary funds might be placed. Interest was given in where programs under Great Streets may be placed. Mr. Ford noted Great Streets started with funding from IJA allocation. The lines get blurred when discussing safety and mobility to find more funds that carry the program forward. It was noted more discussion is needed on how we can make limited funds reach our goals between Federal, state and local funds.
- Sarah Iannarone noted the Great Streets conversation in the legislature this session landed with a giant thud at \$1M dollars. Hall Blvd received \$3M and Powell Blvd received \$0.
- Glen Bolen with smaller funding it's likely to have ability for funding programs when the outcomes fall in the same location/program area. Taking advantage of matches and descriptions will maximize benefits.
- Danielle Maillard asked what the matrix was for considering safety projects when allocating remaining funds. What makes a project "safe"? Mr. Ford noted different descriptions between the RTP and ODOT allocations. Examples were given. Input is welcome on where safety projects would be given priorities in the STIP. A link was noted to the ARTS program. I believe this is where most of the Safety funds are allocated in 24-27 draft STIP:  
<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/engineering/pages/arts.aspx>
- Indi Namkoong noted that based on feedback for community members involved in the RTP process, safety was the highest priority for the most vulnerable people on streets and transportation. These programs seem to be the first cut or decreased for funding. It was

suggested to have strings attached and define what the projects mean when allocating funds based on the needs of the most vulnerable.

- Ted Leybold encouraged an ongoing conversation in terms of coming back with feedback around policy outcomes. ODOT had more funds when IJJA passed with significant money and policy conversations taking place. It was encouraged to have the same approach with development of this conservative forecast, or a concern the same programs will be funded and cut the more innovative programs. Funds may come in higher than projected, and discussions should include these possibilities of funding, not just what we are cutting back. Policy outcomes around safety need to be incorporated.
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted the forecasts don't always anticipate funding we know are in the pipeline, so this may be a good time to prepare for future funding and be ready when funds are available. The Oregon Community Paths Program was noted. There was interest in understanding the crosswalk between public and active transportation safety elements. Mr. Ford agreed projects listed in one category are often elements of several safety projects. Mr. Bolen noted the Oregon Community Paths Program has a certain amount of money that cannot be moved due to the revenues raised from the bicycle tax.
- Mike McCarthy listed his two top priorities as maintaining and preserving the current system for roads, bridges and infrastructure, and spending on the system safety where we have a demonstrated history where fatalities happen. It was noted that if we had added indexed gas tax to inflation we wouldn't have to have this conversation now. As far as funding mechanisms support as you go, if you want to pay less, drive less.

Support was not given to tolls that would cause traffic to divert off freeways and onto surface arterials causing serious crashes. Support was given to gas tax per vehicle mile, tax for electrical vehicles, and better pay as you go if it wouldn't cause diversion off one facility onto another.

- Chair Kloster asked about where OReGO is going and if there are plans to ramp this up to create a better option to pay as you go. Mr. Ford noted more will be known soon with plans for the program and reported. Mr. Bolen noted plans being discussed are for a focused road user charge. The OReGO is set up to be about the same gas tax you'd get on a 20mpg vehicle. <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/programs/pages/orego.aspx>
- Karen Buehrig noted we like Great Streets but where does it live? Clackamas County has two types of projects that would fit into this category: road improvements in Rhododendron on Highway 26, and McLoughlin investment strategy. Regarding additional funding sources, it would be helpful to understand impacts on projects with these potential new funding sources that may come into the 24-30 cycle. As an example, toll revenue and what the impacts of this with revenue coming in possibly 2026 and what that means to projected impacts for funding. Another program that may be implemented in this time frame is the mentioned OReGO program.
- Sarah Iannarone noted the HCAS study showed freight overpaying by 30% of the system, and passenger and transit underpaying. It was asked how the recalibration would affect projections and priorities in the STIP. It was noted ODOT has quite a significant amount tied to the ADA liability. When looking at project costs this is a significant investment.

It was suggested to emphasize the need for a statewide Safe Streets investment strategy that highlights safety and generates funding from the system, while not undermining funding for most needed areas from equity focus areas. It was asked how we are integrating

all of these processes in our region and how do we go beyond the equity matrix that was established from Great Streets.

- Indi Namkoong asked if there has been any exploration of larger projects captured in the 27-30 STIP that looks at reducing scope or scale due to rising costs. Mr. Ford noted projects get funded in many ways. ODOT's Office of Urban Mobility and Mega Project Delivery has information on funding with large projects that could help describe these sources.

*There was a short break at this time in the meeting.*

**2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Overview of Fall adoption package and discussion of draft Chapter 8** (Kim Ellis and John Mermin, Metro) The presentation began with a reminder of two memos in the meeting packet; 2023 Regional Transportation Plan – Schedule and Adoption Package, and 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Chapter 8 – RTP Implementation. The public comment period for the RTP opens July 10 and ends August 25. Various methods to share feedback and input was shared.

Chapter 8: Moving Forward Together (Implementation) was reviewed. Updates made to draft Chapter 8 so far include:

- Minor edits to Introduction
- Updated descriptions of regionwide planning and regional programs, completed efforts removed and new efforts added
- Updated descriptions of corridor refinement planning
- Updated descriptions of major project development and new efforts added
- Updated descriptions of data and tool development and two new analysis tools added

Region-wide planning (next 5 years) was reviewed with lead agencies and proposed timing. Included in Chapter 8 is corridor refinement planning that will develop shared investment strategies to address unmet multimodal transportation needs within identified multimodal mobility corridors, link equity, economic, housing and other goals with multimodal management and capital solutions and recommend strategies and phasing to catalyze investment. Innovative data and tools to address existing and emerging planning and policy priorities was described. The process and timeline for updating Chapter 8 was presented.

Comments from the committee:

- Danielle Maillard shared community comments from outreach engagements that felt it was hard to see climate as a priority in the RTP, along with several large projects the focus. Presented was land use structures and infrastructure with vehicle travel accounted for most. It was suggested to take climate out if it's not really going to be a priority. Ms. Ellis noted feedback is welcome with the plans of the RTP that are in draft now, with input to make goals more successful. We are trying to balance goals, including climate strategies, but other projects coming into the RT have not always prioritized climate goals. Public feedback and the committee input is important to learn what we need to change before final approval.
- Laurie Lebowsky-Young referred to draft Chapter 8, page 102 regarding corridors in the refinement plans. It was noted *This section will be further updated this Summer and informed by analysis of the RTP project list using the newly updated regional mobility policy.* It was asked are you looking at the process for corridor refinement planning, stakeholder groups per corridor, the prioritization and timing of projects, and when the process is plans; this summer or at a different time.

Ms. Ellis noted RTP is not at this time prioritizing for the refinement plan. Planning for corridors will be prioritized when funding is available. Mr. Mermin noted Columbia 2 Clackamas Corridor is the refinement plan that has been completed and is no longer shown in Ch.8. Identifying needs and issues with future corridor planning is ongoing with some projects involved in the process now. Examples given were the new mobility policy, quarterly reports in project planning in the UPWP, and the HCT project development strategy prioritizing projects.

- Karen Buehrig noted the importance of Chapter 8 with the end of the process. It was suggested the chapter be reformatted or restructured to be clearer what projects the region should be working on to reach our goals and what the priorities are. What is already funded and which one don't need to match the funding? MTIP data and tools was suggested to go into a different chapter. It gets lost in other projects. More consistency between projects, programs and system planning is needed.

Regarding the corridor refinement planning, the mobility corridors needs to be tied to how they may be funded. Some funding is through the investment programs, which can be more opportunistic vs. actually identified by priorities. The committee can help with engagement on this. It was suggested to describe projects more clearly as so many have similar names and are hard to distinguish from each other.

It was suggested to focus on investment strategies for regional transportation projects. Define the project and funding specifically. Define funding with carbon reduction programs or climate reduction programs, and tie this in with our climate goals. It was suggested to have more engagement in implementation of electrification of vehicles and how that relates to our work. The 2040 Refresh description needs updating. Many references to pre-quarter strategy are outdated and do not connect with our priorities. It should better reflect what our intent is of the 2040 Refresh strategy.

- Jaimie Lorenzini suggested Chapter 8 strengthen the tie between Metro's work and transportation with the outcomes we are trying to achieve such as good land use and communities and strategies to achieve them. It was noted Metro Council placed a high value on transportation readiness in expansion areas. It was suggested to expand to focus on transportation readiness in expansion areas, particularly Clackamas County given recent Urban Growth Boundary adjustment. Are there other RTP programs that could help expansion areas achieve infrastructure readiness?

Regarding congestion pricing, the current draft seems to focus on alignment between policies of various governments. It was suggested to clarify how the various plans layer and how the RTP will apply at the project-level. Regarding Connecting First and Last Mile: Accessing Mobility - Should this study also contemplate urban expansion areas, levels of service in suburban/urban expansion areas, user safety/amenities, and TriMet's former work on a pedestrian access plan? Regarding tolling it was asked how will Chapter 8 approach changing assumptions (i.e., postponing third lane on I-205) if projects are delayed.

Ms. Ellis appreciated the specific feedback which is helpful in further discussions about each topic. Regarding changing assumptions this is something we need to figure out. Other challenges we have for Chapter 8 in future planning are trying to incorporate multiple goals within projects and noting the length of transportation planning over time and scope.

- Eric Hesse noted the importance of priority focus that provides context to show how we get our goals. It was suggested the appendices might be helpful in providing this focus. Additional elements that come forward on corridor refinement plans with specific timelines and details will be helpful. The coming discussion on Regional Mobility Policy measures tested can help inform for evaluations considered for potential corridors. It was suggested the pricing policies continuing work may include possible Functional Plan language.

It was asked how much the RTP will duplicate what the UPWP does on an annual basis, than what the RTP does in a 5-year plan. Ms. Ellis noted we needed a place to document the quarterly refinement plan per requirements. There are 17 identified in the RTP. It has evolved over time to map out priorities with the UPWP providing what studies and scopes of projects can build on the project descriptions in the RTP. It was noted there be known more about coupling congestion pricing amendments with the funding structure, and tools for evaluating planned projects.

- Eliot Rose added several links in chat that were relevant to the conversation: For those who want to learn more about VisionEval, there's homepage with full documentation of how the model works here: <https://visioneval.org/>  
Climate and Transportation Expert Panel: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/events/climate-and-transportation-expert-panel/2022-06-22>  
Congestion Pricing Study Expert Panel (scroll down): <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/regional-congestion-pricing-study>  
ODOT's Statewide Transportation Strategy has more information on how and why responsibility for reducing GHGs is divided between the state and local/regional agencies: <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/planning/pages/sts.aspx>
- Mike McCarthy noted the example presented with I-5/Highway 99 connector, and how this state highway dead ends in Sherwood with traffic that continues to increase. It was asked what modeling tools and assumptions are being used to get us to our climate goals in the RTP. Ms. Ellis noted Metro has some data, but ODOT's Office of Urban Mobility has developed tools that are being shared. Presentations on this information will be provided at future meetings. Mr. McCarthy noted the focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions is at odds with the modeling where you have stepped away from using these proxies. It was felt the best proxy to use would be fuel consumption. Vehicle hours traveled seemed a little closer. When you get to vehicle miles traveled we are getting farther away because we are looking into a scenario that puts more congestion into the system, which produces much more pollutants into the air over free-flowing traffic. Ms. Ellis noted the state sets the rules in measuring which we are obligated to follow, but future planning and modeling can improve this.
- Dyami Valentine noted the importance of mobility corridors but it was problematic in Washington County because of the number of regional needs that aren't reflected in the mobility corridors that are encountering rapid growth and travel. It was asked if there would be consideration for re-prioritizing in the next RTP or amended into the current planned RTP. Ms. Ellis noted information on UGB expansions and county level planning would be helpful to know.

**Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC** (Chair Kloster) none received.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marie Miller".

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, July 7, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	7/7/2023	7/7/2023 TPAC Agenda	070723T-01
2	2023 TPAC Work Program	6/30/2023	2023 TPAC Work Program as of 6/30/2023	070723T-02
3	Memo	6/29/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments (Late May 2023 through late June 2023)	070723T-03
4	Handout	July 2023	Public comment opportunity - July 10 to Aug. 25, 2023 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	070723T-04
5	Memo	6/30/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2024-2027 MTIP Adoption Draft	070723T-05
6	RESOLUTION NO. 23-5335	N/A	Resolution No. 23-5335 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2024-2027 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA	070723T-06
7	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5335	June 2023	Exhibit A to Resolution 23-5335 2024-2027 ADOPTION DRAFT Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program	070723T-07
8	Exhibit B to Resolution 23-5335	June 2023	Exhibit B to Resolution 23-5335 Appendices 2024-27 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)	070723T-08
9	Staff Report	6/29/2023	2024-2027 MTIP adoption draft Staff Report IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 23-5335, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE 2024-2027 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA	070723T-09
10	Memo	6/30/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2027-2030 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Development – ODOT 2027-2030 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Revenue Discussion	070723T-10
11	Presentation	July 7, 2023	2027-2030 STIP Development (sent with packet)	070723T-11

12	Memo	July 7, 2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan – Schedule and Adoption Package	070723T-12
13	Memo	June 30, 2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager, and John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – Chapter 8 – RTP Implementation	070723T-13
14	Draft Chapter	6/30/2023	Chapter 8 Moving Forward Together 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	070723T-14
15	Slide	7/7/2023	Monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	070723T-15
16	Presentation	7/7/2023	2024-2027 MTIP – Overview of Adoption Draft	070723T-16
17	Presentation	7/7/2023	2027-2030 STIP Development (UPDATED)	070723T-17
18	Presentation	7/7/2023	2023 Regional Transportation Plan Process Update & Chapter 8	070723T-18