

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**
Date/time: Wednesday July 12, 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
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Indi Namkoong
Katherine Kelly

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
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
Community Representative at Large
Community Representative, The Street Trust
Community Representative, Verde
City of Vancouver

Alternates Attending

Steve Williams
Adam Fiss
Will Farley
Gregg Snyder
Neelam Dorman

Affiliate

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

Members Excused

Judith Perez
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Lewis Lem
Ellie Gluhosky
Danielle Maillard
Jasia Mosley
Jasmine Harris
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy
Ned Conroy
Rian Sallee

Affiliate

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative, OPAL
Community Representative, Oregon Walks
Community Representative at Large
Federal Highway Administration
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Bruce Moody
Bryan Graveline
Chris Smith
Cody Field
Dave Roth
Jacqui Treiger
Jessica Engelmann
John Charles
Julia Wean
Kate Bridges
Kirsten Beale
Lucia Ramirez
Matt Berkow
Micah DeSilva
Nick Fortey
Trevor Mace
Vanessa Vissar

Affiliate

FHWA
Portland Bureau of Transportation

City of Tualatin
City of Tigard
Oregon Environmental Council
City of Beaverton
Cascade Policy Institute
Steer
Steer
WSP
Oregon Department of Transportation
Portland Bureau of Transportation

FHWA
Clark County
Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Daniel Audelo, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Grace Stainback, John Mermin, Kim Ellis, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Michaela Barton, Noel Mickelberry, Ted Leybold, Thaya Patton, Tom Kloster

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. The link for providing 'safe space' at the meeting was shared in the chat area.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Updates on various Oregon Department of Transportation funding programs (Chris Ford, ODOT) An informational forum meeting hosted by ODOT Region 1 was announced regarding an overview of the auxiliary lanes planning. This meeting was later cancelled.

ODOT and Metro staff have been having a series of discussions around the Motor Vehicle Policies. This is in coordination with other policy planning and will be presented soon.

ODOT funding programs were reported on. The **Innovative Mobility Program (IMP)** is a new initiative from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) that aims to improve access to public transportation, reduce the number of trips Oregonians make by car, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The IMP has a special focus on equity and helping historically excluded groups to get to where they need to go more quickly, cheaply and safely. The IMP is funded by Infrastructure, Investment and Jobs Act, passed by Congress in November 2021, as well as state of Oregon dollars. The program has a total of \$20 million for grants and contracts from 2022-25.

The **Carbon Reduction Program** is a new federal program created by the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law that will provide Oregon \$82 million over five years to fund projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. The program provides funding for three types of areas: Transportation Management Areas, ODOT statewide projects, and Small Urban and Rural areas.

- Transportation management areas are the urbanized areas of Portland, Eugene and Salem. The regional agencies for these areas will decide which projects get funded in their jurisdictions.
- ODOT statewide projects are projects overseen by ODOT. The agency will decide which projects to fund using federal and state criteria.
- Small urban and rural areas include counties, cities, rural areas, and tribal governments with populations less than 200,000. ODOT will coordinate a grant program to distribute the federal funding for eligible projects in these areas.

The **National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Formula Program** will provide funding to states to strategically deploy electric vehicle (EV) charging stations and to establish an interconnected network to facilitate data collection, access, and reliability. Funding is available for up to 80% of eligible project costs. The \$100 million funding for EV charging committed by ODOT will be spend over the next 5 years. About two-thirds of the funding — \$52 million from the [2021 federal infrastructure bill](#) plus a required 20% match — must be spent on EV charging infrastructure along designated Alternative Fuel Corridors, as per guidance from the Federal Highway Administration. Oregon has 11 roads designated as "electric corridors" under the NEVI program: Interstates 5, 82, 84, 205 and 405; US Highways 20, 26, 95, 97 and 101; and OR Highway 42. ODOT may propose additional roads for designation over the next five years. The remaining third of the money — \$36 million — will be used to close EV infrastructure gaps beyond those 11 roads.

Great Streets Program is a funding program that address safety improvements and increases access to walking, biking, and transit. It focuses on “main streets” in communities around the state. ODOT is launching this program with \$50 million of flexible federal transportation funds from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. Initial investments will be limited to highway corridors that the state owns and manages. This first round of funding will serve as a proof-of-concept so we can learn more in developing future versions of the program.

Ted Leybold asked what opportunities were available to provide input on these decisions before project selections are made. Mr. Ford noted materials from the OTC would give further information with public and agency input welcome in the process. Sarah Iannarone asked what the revenue source for the 20% local match on NEVI program would be. Mr. Ford noted the 20% match will come from the private sector partner that we select through the competitive RFP.

Updates on Regional Mobility Policy Draft Throughway Travel Speed Analysis (Kim Ellis, Metro) The committee was reminded of the public comment period on draft 2023 RTP, with a link in chat shared for all document links. <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/2023-regional-transportation-plan/public-comment> The memo in the packet (pg. 6) provides an update on additional work completed and underway to inform finalizing the draft policy, measures and targets/thresholds for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A second memo (pg. 8) summarizes work to develop a methodology and to calculate initial observed and modeled travel speed metrics for throughways designated in the RTP for the region. This work supports further testing and refinement of the draft Regional Mobility Policy (RMP). Karen Buehrig suggested small group sessions on the measures that would be helpful on educating the local practitioners about these issues to better address comments on the RTP.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, May 10, 2023 (Chair Kloster) Edits or corrections were asked to be sent to Marie Miller. No edits/corrections were received. Meeting summary approved.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Regional Mobility Policy TDM/TSMO System Completeness Measures and Implementation (Kim Ellis and Grace Stainback, Metro/ Kate Bridges, Steer) Kate Bridges began the presentation with a reminder of the purpose of the Regional Mobility Policy Update, to update the mobility policy and how we define and measure mobility for the Portland area transportation system, and recommend amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan and Oregon Highway Plan Policy 1F for the Portland area. Three measures are included in the draft RMP (VMT/Capita, System Completeness, and Reliability of Throughways. This presentation focused on System Completeness.

Defining System Completeness was noted for the definition: What makes a complete (Transportation Demand Management) TDM/(Transportation System Management & Operations) TSMO system? What should be considered baseline, defined and optimized?

Roles and responsibilities: What are Metro’s role and responsibilities? What roadblocks might be encountered by jurisdictions, mobility operators, and agencies?

Updated Regional Mobility Policy: How will this be implemented within the context of the Mobility Policy Update? Transportation and Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Various overviews were shown of system completeness from baseline to optimized.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Ford asked Steer staff if there was an order to this in terms of land use, regulations and transportation from your planning experience. It was noted the baseline made sense, but not sure each jurisdiction is up to date on land use plans that incorporate affordable housing and housing development. Did you have a recommendation to get this started? Ms. Bridges noted it was likely they would work in tandem with the land use component more incorporated in comprehensive plan amendments. That may trigger how it affects projects under the baseline.

Ted Leybold noted this is something we need to look at in more detail. Ms. Ellis added work on the 2040 Growth Concept and Urban Growth Management Plan and Functional Plan have identified issues that set our foundation in the region for locally adopted plans. We can leverage and build on these with the required CFEC land use regulations.

- Karen Buehrig noted the baseline column on slide 13 may need to be in our TDM plan or both TDM and TSMO plan. Under Design where it says “incorporate into gap analysis, demonstrate alignment with 2040 Growth Concept, RTP policies, and TPR/CFEC”. It was asked what that means and what kind of action would that be for a local jurisdiction. Ms. Bridges noted we are hoping this baseline is considering all these elements and will be documented in the TSP. And if the TSP makes reference to an external TDM or TSMO plan that’s acceptable. But it needs to include language that highlights these considerations and needs to be included in that external plan, such as demonstrating compilation with the 2040 Growth Concept with bullets showing how this has happened to suffice.

Discussion was held on plans interacting with the RTP, including functional plans, CFEC requirements, TDM and TSPs. Functional plans were noted for providing direction on what needs to be included in the inventory of the TDM. Parking, wayfinding, pricing and design elements would need to be documented in the TSP. The TSP can point to a TDM strategy.

- Dyami Valentine noted that Washington County has done a fair amount of work identifying baseline priority elements. But there is a need for concurrence and agreement so if we’ve done

a baseline analysis and determined the context is going to be important at a County level we have determined some of this is not feasible at certain levels. That establishes the next level between County/City with limited capabilities and set of opportunities to implement some of these programs. But the concurrence is important, and we look at Metro to respond to what that might look like.

- Eric Hesse noted the gap analysis in the baseline elements which can help bring all the pieces together. With the CFEC required elements in the design of the TDM it will be important to sync into what ODOT and DLCD are doing. Ms. Ellis noted discussions with plans are being coordinated with agencies and more work is yet to be done. They are working together to provide guidance at the statewide level on CFEC implementation. There is overlap and we are sharing information to members of the project management team with work on the Mobility Policy statewide work as well.
- Bill Beamer noted the whole perspective and approach with transportation planning is not inclusive, and not considering opportunities to address equity at mid-level and upstream levels. This impacts communities of color regarding transportation in ways with pedestrian and transit. There are many more priority opportunities to address transportation. The current definition of plans does not allow further opportunities to take advantage of these things.

In some TDM organizations and planning groups the perspective is not coming from those impacted communities and what's really important to them. To define things to this very small downstream level you are not taking into account the impact of your transportation plans. Transportation plans from past decades where investments and time planning were thought to be solutions, but the problems continue to increase. There is a real gap between plans that are not including perspectives of communities.

Ms. Bridges began the next section of the presentation on transportation system plans. A graphic showing RTP updates every 5 years with TSP updates and amendments noted. It was noted the Functional Plan Update 2024-2025 will define how local governments implement the new mobility policy.

Sarah Iannarone suggested thought be given to refining equity measures in the next RTP with how they are contributing to instability and lack of opportunity. Refinements to equity measures and evaluation as they relate to disparities in geographics, economic impacts and infrastructure investments can provide a fast track for better progress. Indi Namkoong strongly agreed these would be really useful. Ms. Ellis noted this can be an activity called out in Chapter 8.

A case study of Clackamas County was reviewed. Karen Buehrig noted this is helpful to see how the elements are applied and see the variety of places to consider for the TSP to be in compliance. Steve Williams noted it may be challenging to incorporate all the elements into the TSP given the County is currently under an update now. Ms. Bridges asked for confirmation that the next TSP update would ideally be before 2028. Ms. Ellis noted the Functional Plan update in 2024-25 can give direction on TSP planned updates.

A case study of the City of Beaverton was reviewed. Jessica Engelmann noted we are pretty good at checking the boxes in terms of actually operation and achieving outcomes. The process laid out is appreciated. But its on the cities and counties to figure out details. TDM is an umbrella in terms of everything coming together, where you can enhance things and pair with policy. It was suggested to do more behavior planning to show impacts and direct better investments in the future.

Gregg Snyder noted a lot of money was spent over 18 months planning the City of Hillsboro TSP completed in 2021. It was expected to have a shelf life of 6-8 years. It was asked if an updated was needed between 2025-28 or is this a voluntary requirement. Ms. Ellis noted it's not mandatory. Part of the conversation we'll have with the Functional Plan update is with coordination with local governments. Mr. Snyder suggested that when talking about TSP updates note they are not mandatory but a voluntary process. Interest with discussion on planned amendments next was expressed given new growth in the area.

A graphic was presented on how Plan Amendments interact with TSP/System Completeness. The requirements for plan amendments were reviewed for TDM and TSMO. Options for recommendations for plan amendments was given. Two case studies were reviewed: one for Colwood Industrial District and the other for the City of Hillsboro Community Development Plan. Chris Ford noted there can be challenges with possible mitigations that happen between jurisdictions. ODOT works with cities and counties looking to find multi-jurisdictional solutions.

Support from Metro is planned with Regional Collaboration, Tools and Resources, Funding and Investments, and Direct Services. Presenters from Steer were thanked for their great information.

There was a 10-minute break in the meeting.

Draft Transportation System Management & Operation (TSMO) System Completeness and Mobility

Corridors (Caleb Winter, Metro) A summary of TSMO stakeholder workshops was provided. It was noted mobility-focus means actively managing facilities for their primary function and managing demand away from trips outside mobility corridors. Mobility corridors have capacity for multimodal trips. The TSMO gap analysis was described. Elements of this include:

- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture and Interoperability
- ODOT Procedures manual
- 2023 RTP System Management: actively managing throughways and arterials
- TSMO Stakeholder input that supports TSMO in RTP Mobility Corridors

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig asked if the suggested changes collected from the workshops is going to be submitted by Metro as changes to the RTP draft or agencies asked to submit them as part of the public comment period. Mr. Winter noted the information from the workshops were gathered from agencies around the region. Having it reflected in the RTP and included in the management system helps bring forward improvements with TSMO projects. It was noted that changes on the 2023 RTP System Management Map (Figure 3-38 in Chapter 3 of the public review draft 2023 RTP) can be given in public comment and through the TransPort committee for consideration. <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/regional-tsmo-strategy/meetings>
- Eric Hesse asked if suggestions from workshops were already reflected in the map. Mr. Winter noted they were but welcomed further comments and input. It was asked what the timeline was for getting the Regional ITS Architecture & Operational Plan updated. Mr. Winter noted time was needed to develop this and would not be expected as a full update for another 2 years from now. It was asked is the Mobility Corridors presented more in the context of RTP updates or TSMO corridors. Mr. Winter noted TSMO in RTP Mobility Corridors that supports mobility in both directions across one or more jurisdictional boundaries, making a connection between one RTP urban growth land use and another, going forward for cities and counties to help update their TSPs.

- Tara O'Brien asked for clarification where pieces on feedback is needed. Mr. Winter confirmed the comments from the map and transit services named by Ms. O'Brien would be discussed at Transport before coming back to TPAC with a recommendation.

The presentation concluded with information on defining TSMO System Completeness. Workshop notes were shared. Draft definition given:

The TSMO system is complete when:

- Operators automate or change field device settings via high-speed data connections, sharing permissions with other operators and sharing data with travelers.
- Local systems are interoperable with regional and state systems so that travelers and freight carriers can:
 - opt-in to receive customized traveler information by time of day, location and duration of travel from origin to destination (inside and outside of region).
 - participate in, or encounter demand management capable of a 4% reduction in demand lasting 2 hours from when it is first needed.
- Incident responders are trained in incident management
- End-of-life assets are replaced in advance of breaking, degraded performance or system incompatibility (calling attention to digital infrastructure equipment that is often underground).
- The benefits of a managed transportation system are shared equitably.

Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC – none received

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, July 12, 2023

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	7/12/2023	7/12/2023 TPAC Workshop Agenda	071223T-01
2	2023 TPAC Work Program	7/5/2023	2023 TPAC Work Program as of 7/5/2023	071223T-02
3	Memo	7/5/2023	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, AICP, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 Regional Transportation Plan: Regional Mobility Policy Next Steps	071223T-03
4	Memo	7/5/2023	TO: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager From: Joe Broach, Senior Researcher and Modeler Peter Bosa, Principal Researcher and Modeler RE: Draft Throughways Travel Speed Analysis for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)	071223T-04
5	Minutes	May 10, 2023	Draft minutes from May 10, 2023 TPAC workshop meeting	071223T-05
6	Presentation	7/12/2023	TDM /TSMO System Completeness	071223T-06
7	Presentation	7/12/2023	Draft Transportation System Management & Operations System Completeness and Mobility Corridors	071223T-07
8	Presentation	7/12/2023	UPDATED Draft Transportation System Management & Operations, System Completeness and Mobility Corridors	071223T-08
9	Presentation	7/12/2023	UPDATED TDM / TSMO System Completeness	071223T-09