



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, April 5, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Ted Leybold, Vice Chair
Karen Buehrig
Joanna Valencia
Chris Deffebach
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Don Odermott
Jeff Owen
Laurie Lebowsky
Phil Healy
Rachael Tupica
Tyler Bullen
Glenn Koehrsen
Jessica Stetson
Maria Hernandez- Segoviano
Emily Lai
Beverly Drottar

Affiliate

Metro
Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Federal Highway Administration
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Steve Williams
Jaimie Huff
Jay Higgins
Jon Makler
Glen Bolen
Melanie Ware

Affiliate

Clackamas County
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Jennifer Campos

Affiliate

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
City of Vancouver

Guests Attending

Justin Shoeuah
Sam Hunadi
Talena Adams

Affiliate

Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Anna Slatinsky
Bob Kellett
Michael Walter
Kate Freitag
Jeff Flowers

City of Beaverton
Portland Bureau of Transportation
City of Happy Valley
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Margi Bradway, Dep. Dir., Planning & Dev.
Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Daniel Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner
Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Strategist

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 called and introductions were made.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Announcement: NTI Course at Metro “Introduction to Environmental Justice”, May 6 & 7, 2019** (Chairman Kloster) Materials in the packet were explained on this course, offered from the National Transit Institute. Metro, as host, will provide up to 10 free registrations to TPAC members, staff and MPO staff for the 2-day course. Members that are interested in attending should contact Marie Miller.
- **Announcement: ODOT Innovation Grant** (Eliot Rose) Mr. Rose provided information on the grant awarded from ODOT for an innovative program on a standup computer program to manage dockless bikes and scooters. Shared data with the computer programming makes it possible to spread costs over more of the region for better efficiency and operations. Challenges to monitor compliance with regulations with companies unfamiliar with the region will be addressed. The grant was based on collaboration of agencies, with an advisory group forming soon. Mr. Rose encouraged the committee to contact him with questions and interest.
- **Update on Special Transportation Funds (STF) Status** (Jeff Owen) Following the last report to TPAC on STF in the budget, Mr. Owen reported on potential good news of \$10m STF funds that were discussed earlier as possible reductions, was included in the Ways & Means draft budget, indicating the potential to avoid this reduction. More information on the budget outcome will be provided at the next TPAC meeting.
- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Mr. Lobeck referred to materials in the packet with his memo, regarding March 2019 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments. This summary provides an overview of submitted amendment from the mid-February through the first half of March 2019. For any questions on the projects in the summary the committee is encouraged to contact Mr. Lobeck.

- **RFFA Application** (Ted Leybold) Mr. Leybold announced that both the MTIP and RFFA policy documents that the committee had reviewed were approved by the Metro Council. Handouts were provided at the meeting: *2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) project application instruction and guidance*, and *2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Project Application*. These would be posted on the Metro website soon. The draft materials are still undergoing refinements, with comments provided to Mr. Leybold. It was noted that the application served two project types; Active Transportation and Complete Streets, or Freight and Economic Development Initiatives. Applicants are able to apply for one category or both, and should indicate this for consideration on their applications.
- **Draft 100% lists for the 21-24 STIP** (Jon Makler) Mr. Makler referred to material in the packet titled 2021-2024 STIP First Draft 100% List – Region 1 All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) Program. This preliminary project list contains several categories of funding, fix-it programs and leverage programs. It was noted that over the next three months more evaluation of projects will take place.

The ARTS program allocates funds in four sub-categories based on cost-effectiveness. Bridge, Culvert and Interstate Maintenance Pavement programs are administered on a statewide basis. Region Preservation Pavement and Operations are administered within the region. The Oregon Transportation Commission allocated certain amounts of “leverage” funding to Region 1 in each of three categories and provided guidance on the use of these funds. Selected projects must leverage a project in the 21-24 Fix-It programs (Bridge, Culvert, Pavement, Operations, ARTS) or in HB2017.

The materials also noted projects that were not advanced to the 100% list. May 10 is the deadline for the ACT to provide feedback on the draft 100% list. Region 1 ACT next meets June 3. The committee is encouraged to add input to this information as well.

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler introduced Melanie Ware, ODOT Interim Planning Manager for the next year, starting in May. Ms. Ware has strong experience with several projects at ODOT and will serve on TPAC as an alternate member when Mr. Makler is on leave starting in June. Glen Bolen was noted for as the contact for MPO liaison.
- Chairman Kloster noted upcoming reports with Jurisdictional Transfer Assessment Projects, part of the RTP. John Mermin is the Project Manager.
- Jeff Owen noted the Transportation Task Force webpage on the Metro website. Documents and materials on transportation issues are posted for review.
- Chris Deffebach asked when the committee would receive an update on Enhanced Transit Concepts (ETC). Jamie Snook reported this was currently listed in the parking lot in the work program, but there are several projects happening quickly and the update should be done before summer. Ms. Snook will confer with Kelly Betteridge on a planned report to TPAC.
- Jon Makler brought to attention the commitment of TPAC workshops addressing equity, which to date have not been done. Chairman Kloster reported on plans to have a consultant coming to the May TPAC meeting where training courses would be discussed.
- Karen Buehrig announced that Clackamas County has posted a job opening for Regional Land Use and Transportation Policy Coordinator. Information on this is listed on the County website.

- Emily Lei reminded TPAC members that with the upcoming equity training planned, the entire committee is responsible for participation and input. This information needs to be more shared with collective input from all the committee. Chairman Kloster agreed and confirmed that the goal setting with the training workshops would involve the full committee.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items - none

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from February 20, 2019 and March 1, 2019

MOTION: To approve the minutes from February 20, 2019 and March 1, 2019 as presented.

Moved: Phil Healy

Seconded: Katherine Kelly

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with three abstentions: Laurie Lebowsky, Emily Lai and Tyler Bullen.

5. MTIP Formal Amendment Resolution 19-4983 Mr. Lobeck provided information on the April 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment with request for approval of Resolution 19-4983. This requires changes and updates to one project impacting SMART, summarized as follows:

Proposed April 2019 Formal Amendment Bundle

Amendment Type: Formal/Full

Amendment #: AP19-08-APR

Total Number of Projects: 1

Lead Agency SMART

Project Name: Purchase 1 Replacement 30 ft Low-Floor diesel Bus (SMART)

Project Description: FTA 5339(b) 2016 Discretionary Funding Award, D2016-BUSP-042, procurement of one low-floor 30-foot replacement bus

Description of Changes:

ADD NEW PROJECT: The formal amendment adds SMART's discretionary FTA 5339(b) grant award to the MTIP enabling them to move forward and receive their grant funds to procure the replacement 30-foot diesel bus.

MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT of Resolution 19-4983 Formal Amendment to the 2018 MTIP as presented.

Moved: Jeff Owen

Seconded: Glenn Koehrsen

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstention: Emily Lai.

6. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Resolution 19-4979 Mr. Mermin provided the committee with a recap of proposed edits to the UPWP based on feedback received at the March 6 federal and state consultation meeting. TPAC was also asked to suggest further edits before taking action on a recommendation to JPACT of the proposed 2019-20 UPWP.

Metro received feedback through written comments provided in advance, as well as verbal comments at the consultation meeting. Feedback included "housekeeping" suggestions (e.g. fixing typos, minor wording changes, formatting, etc.) as well as more substantive changes. This memo summarizes the substantive changes to which Metro staff is responding:

- Add a narrative for FTA Pilot project "City of Portland Transit & Equitable Development

Assessment.” See Attachment 1 for text of the new narrative

- Describe in the Introduction section of the document that the UPWP is implementing the 4 RTP priorities that Metro Council and JPACT expressed as the most critical: advancing equity, improving safety, Climate Smart Strategy implementation and managing congestion.

- In next year’s UPWP (2020-21) ask the author of each individual narrative to address how the program/plan will implement these 4 priorities.

- For the 2020-21 UPWP consider changing the format to better link one-time plans with related on-going programs

-Revise MTIP narrative to show a more comprehensive view of the MTIP (e.g. ODOT and transit agency-led work, not just RFFA)

- Revise summary budget table at the end of the document to make it easier to understand.

- Add clarifying text to Corridor Refinement narrative on the process for which corridors move forward for studying.

Next steps in the process are for JPACT to take action on the UPWP May 16, then Metro Council action the same day. The document will be submitted to USDOT and ODOT May 20, with time to allow the IGA signed by Metro COO by June 30.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen. Buehrig recommended removing the word “proposed” in the Metropolitan Planning Area map to identify the boundary, no longer proposed.

Ms. Buehrig asked where the new narrative “City of Portland Transit and Equitable Development Assessment” project would be placed in the UPWP. And if this project is led by the City of Portland, who was the project manager. Mr. Leybold reported that Metro was the grantee of the project and would defer to FTA consultation for the lead on the project. Still to be determined was in which section of the UPWP this would be placed.

- Rachael Tupica asked for clarification on the new narrative, and the origin of the project. Mr. Leybold reported this was a new federal grant award for the project, in the corridor refinement planning area, where it will be placed once with more clarification on scope and project development planning.
- Jon Makler commented on the presentation noting what the UPWP is not: not a funding decision document, does not allocate funds. Yet it was noted federal funds are allocated to projects through these projects, with commitments approved by JPACT and Metro Council that are obligated to meet federal funding requirements. Chairman Kloster clarified the UPWP was for planning purposes with budgets developed for the projects, starting with Metro funds. Additions to the motion to approve this draft of the UPWP to JPACT can include amendments that address the budget discussion. TPAC, its role to advise JPACT and Council can express its concern with capacity for the region to tackle so many projects in one fiscal year (similar to what TPAC did last year when it commented on there not being enough resources assigned to finishing off the 2018 RTP update).

- Maria Hernandez-Segoviano commented on the challenges understanding the budget layout and how this relates to the technical work with partners in the region. The impact from funding with our agencies isn't clear with the goals/purpose of the projects.
- Katherine Kelly agreed with the complexities between technical work of FTE, and the role of public engagement, TPAC and policy development. Each could be included in the document as part of planning. Chairman Kloster added this would be a good next year improvement, seeing like activities and how they relate across similar projects.
- Karen Buehrig asked for confirmation on the document that will be received by JPACT. Chairman Kloster reported that the actual edits, shown in redline or track changes, would be provided to JPACT, with any other edits at TPAC meeting today. This would be included in the motion to recommend to JPACT.

Ms. Buehrig referred to the Corridor Refinements and Development Investments sections of the document. The funding table with this project shows the input funding sources. But the narrative for the project does not show where the funding is expended from the budget. Past work is reported, but what does ongoing support mean for projects? Mr. Leybold added that the budget summary was written for finance staff toward agreements with partners and staff time on projects. It was agreed the breakdown on funding could be clearer, with suggested budget to task reporting rather than budget to staff/consultant time. Chairman Kloster added that evaluations of similar size MPOs may provide good examples for this.

- Rachael Tupica commented on the emphasis for Metro to use more plain language techniques in the document, as this is for public information and review. It is important for the document to clearly tell what is in the work program with each project.

Regarding the budget discussion, a simple funding summary table was suggested. There are various audiences reviewing the document, so a suggested supplemental budget summary could be provided for more technical purposes. Review of the UPWP could be better served throughout the year, not just annually. Chairman Kloster added proposed plans for workshops this fall to discuss formats, budgets and reporting methods. The corrective actions from last years' certification review did not appear to be included in the document. Chairman Kloster noted that adding in the corrective actions tables into the document could be included in the motion TPAC makes for its recommendation to JPACT.

- Chris Deffebach commented on the amount of work this document represents, with the need to communicate better on how the projects interconnect with each other. Caution should be given to budget breakouts that may not allow for future project changes, and have partners differ on expectations. The value of the document has partners focused on working together for common regional projects. Not clear in the UPWP how the regional value pricing analysis relates to ODOT's pricing study. With this project still being developed, how much clarity do we know for planning purposes in the document? More description concerning corridor planning projects is needed.
- Emily Lai commented on the budgets described for corridor development planning, with the summary table not complete or as detailed as it could be matched with the narratives. It was asked who is being informed with the corridor development planning projects and how does this fit with efforts on T2020.

- Margi Bradway provided information on the T2020 bond measure that has a task force meeting every other week to strategize this transportation measure for before voters next year. Projects addressed with the measure are outside MPO planning and not reflected in the UPWP document. The T2020 measure has the advantage of a just completed RTP with a great list of projects, and identified corridors that can help inform voters which corridor planning projects have the potential to develop and fund in the future. Asked if updates throughout the year relating to corridor planning, and progress with T2020, Ms. Bradway confirmed that briefings between JPACT and TPAC might be possible. Staff will work to arrange this.
- Maria Hernandez- Segoviano appreciated the commitment to have further information with the transportation bond measure. There are many pieces to projects and it's sometimes hard to see the dynamics where they all fit. It would help to see where in the corridor planning potential funding from the bond measure fit. When addressing technical assistance with projects in the narratives, identifying equity for hiring across the board, per staff/consultants, and FT/PT basis is hard to see. Evaluations matching goals is also difficult to understand. If this data is available it would help to have this communicated more fully.
- Jeff Owen noted the Metro webpage with documents and presentations for the T2020 Task Force: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/2020-transportation-investment-measure>
- Jon Makler asked to confirm what information JPACT would receive on the UPWP at their April 18 meeting. If included in the motion, this would have edits shown from the certification review, friendly amendments from the last TPAC meeting, and corrective actions addressed from the last certification review.
- Joanna Valencia asked that in the response to feedback from March 6 consultations meeting, to edit as follows: "For the 2020-21 UPWP ~~consider changing~~ revise the organization of the document..."
- Rachael Tupica clarified that comments and suggestions from the consultation review meeting were all friendly amendments. The MPOs have the oversight with specific program planning with funding decisions. Federal agencies are looking for across the board clarity with these documents, and earlier discussions with project additions or changes should be made early before submitted for review next time.

MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT of draft UPWP as presented, with the following amendments:

- **Inclusion of staff recommended friendly amendments**
- **Inclusion of reporting on progress from last years' certification review corrective actions**
- **The UPWP provided to JPACT show edits as redlined/track changes**
- **Edit "consider changing" to "revise" organization of the 2020-21 UPWP document**

Moved: Jeff Owen

Seconded: Chris Deffebach

Discussion on the motion:

- Jon Makler asked that TPAC get a chance to review the tracked changes edits to the UPWP and re-affirm its recommendation at its May 3 meeting.

MOTION TO ADD ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT:

TPAC will reaffirm its recommendation of the UPWP at the May 3 TPAC meeting, based on seeing tracked changes edits to the document.

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Joanna Valencia

ACTION: Motion passed by majority with one abstention: Beverly Drottar.

The original motion was then voted on, reflecting all amendments:

ACTION: Motion passed by majority with two abstentions: Beverly Drottar and Emily Lai.

It was noted that following the JPACT April meeting the UPWP would be electronically sent to TPAC members for discussion at the May 3, 2019 meeting.

7. Columbia to Clackamas (C2C) Project Overview Katherine Kelly provided an overview of the project and introduced the representatives engaged with the project. The Clackamas to Columbia Corridor Plan will deliver a plan for improving north-south travel in the Portland Metro area east of I-205. Comprised of Southeast 181st, 182nd, 190th and 172nd avenues, and connecting I-84 in Multnomah County and Highway 212 in Clackamas County this corridor serves:

- Residential areas in Gresham, Portland, Happy Valley and unincorporated Clackamas County
- Commercial districts and industrial job centers in Clackamas County
- The Columbia Corridor in Gresham, Portland and Multnomah County

The Clackamas to Columbia Corridor is the only major north-south travel route east of I-205. Used heavily as a major travel route, it is not continuous. Improving this route will benefit all modes of travel through some of the fastest growing and most under-served communities in the Metro area. As Gresham, Happy Valley and Clackamas County plan for growth, the area needs an integrated transportation plan. The Clackamas to Columbia Corridor project will deliver a plan for improving north-south travel.

Jay Higgins and Michael Walter presented information on the project. The purposes of the project are to proactively address congestion east of I-205, serve growing communities, connect key employment land and residential areas and provide a safe multimodal transit connection.

Each jurisdiction had its own planning efforts so the coordination of the entire project was challenging. These involved the Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement Plan, Pleasant Valley/North Carver Comprehensive Plan, and the Damascus Mobility Plan. Katherine Kelly added the importance to this corridor was the combination of mobility function but also addressing the growth in residential and industrial areas with job connections. Karen Buehrig thanked the City of Gresham for taking the lead on this project and the coordination between partners. It was emphasized the importance for access to transit on this corridor for jobs and economic development.

Comments from the committee:

- Chairman Kloster asked how the Pleasant Valley TSP Refinement plan addressed development access, and how areas north of Powell Blvd. addressed growing diverse populations. Ms. Kelly reported on community discussions that helped develop both short-term and long-term plans for this area. Urban residential areas in the Rockwood district encompass a wide-range diverse population, speaking 70 different languages. Community involvement is critical in developing transit assess for daily needs, addressing safety concerns, and active transportation projects also.

- Tyler Bullen asked for clarification on page 5 of the presentation, showing plans with bike lanes. Ms. Kelly reported they wanted to show capacity for 2020 growth, and include multimodal facilities on the corridor. The scale on maps will become better identified with engineering plans and better scope from models.
- Chris Deffebach concurred with the efforts facing expected growth, and the need to stay proactive on planning for growth concerning safety and access to transit. Appreciation to the work on the project was given.
- Joanna Valencia agreed with the importance of connections through this area, and thanked the City of Gresham for taking the lead on the project. It was noted there will be a great amount of investment involved for the project. Ms. Kelly agreed, and noted that the jurisdictions collectively agreed to seek potential funding on priorities.
- Maria Hernandez-Sergoviana asked where the funding was coming from to pay for the project. Ms. Kelly noted this was one corridor identified in the T2020 measure for immediate advocacy for the project. Chairman Kloster added that grants from Metro had potential funding for the project through jurisdictional collective applications. Ms. Kelly added this project began with ODOT funding. It was agreed the T2020 funding was important for potential preliminary costs as the project develops, and tracking the best utilization of funding was important.
- Don Odermott complimented work on the project. The west side of the region has the same challenges with employment access on substandard roads, and appreciates the efforts to address this. It was suggested to develop good plans with partners, then develop resources to match the plans, which provides public engagement and support.
- Jon Makler added his appreciation for the efforts on this project. The complexities of this area with coordination of plans were acknowledged.
- Chairman Kloster added a follow up on the project would be welcome at a future TPAC meeting.

8. TransPort Bylaws Recommended Update – tabled until May 3, 2019 meeting. The committee was encouraged to read materials in their packet for taking action on recommended bylaws in May.

9. Obligation Targets Program Ted Leybold provided an overview of the program. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Program and Funding Services division has been working with the large Oregon Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to address the issue of project funding allocated by the MPOs to local projects not being contractually obligated in a timely fashion. This is an important issue because the State of Oregon as a whole must contractually obligate all of its federal transportation funding each year or it risks losing those funds. If the state does obligate all of its federal transportation funding, it becomes eligible to receive funds not obligated by other states.

Currently, when an MPOs is not on track to obligate all of its funds in a specific year, ODOT works with the MPO to ensure the funds are obligated on other eligible projects (such as an ODOT project) and then provides the MPO an equivalent amount of funding in a future year. This is a burden on ODOTs administrative capacity, however, and their ability to find eligible projects can be difficult.

Therefore, ODOT, in consultation with the large MPOs, is proposing a new system that will encourage MPO areas to perform better in on-time funding obligation and project delivery to reduce the risk that Oregon will lose any federal transportation funds.

Jeff Flowers provided information on the representatives to the three Transportation Management Areas (TMA's) to discuss and work on this issue. The three TMA's are provided a sub-allocation of the federal funding. This funding is used for their own project selection processes. The TMA funds also have the same requirements to obligate their share of the federal funds to ensure the State of Oregon does not lose federal funding. Oregon Local Public Agencies (LPAs) are not obligating a sufficient amount of federal funds allocated to their transportation projects.

Proposal:

Increase the amount of federal funding obligated by the LPA's in the three TMAs incrementally over the next 8 years and if targets are met, provides a proportional share of annual federal redistribution received in Oregon. This will be accomplished by reviewing three-year rolling averages to ensure LPA's are meeting the requirements.

Rewards:

For each 3 year rolling period that the LPA's meet their minimum target, the TMA will rewarded with their share of the annual federal redistribution. If all three TMA's meet their target the total reward amount would equate to approximately 10.8% of the total annual redistribution for Oregon.

Penalties:

The penalty amount is set up as a 3 strike process if the TMA doesn't meet their minimum 3-year target. The penalty structure is as follows:

- Strike 1 – TMA loses 25% of unobligated authority from that 3 year period
- Strike 2 – TMA loses 50% of unobligated authority from that 3 year period
- Strike 3 – TMA loses 100% of unobligated authority from that 3 year period
- If TMA is able to meet their obligation targets for 1 years straight, their strike penalty would be reduced to prior strike or the initial strike removed. For example:
 - o The TMA has already been assessed the Strike 2 penalty. The TMA then obligates their funding for the next four years, they would be moved back to the Strike 1 category.

Mr. Leybold added next steps to the proposed establishment for funding obligation targets and Metro follow ups. These included project risk assessment in RFFA process, project tracking progress reporting, pro-active programming work, and active participation in Exceptions and MOU processes.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig encouraged ODOT to reach out to the capital team with the county as they are the ones that deliver projects, as opposed to policy makers. Encouragement was given to gather input from certified agencies that deliver projects to help on this discussion. On the policy element, it's with anticipation that future TPAC meetings will hold conversations to additional funding from this. The official decision making process is unclear of TPAC yet. Mr. Leybold acknowledged this information would be shared with JPACT, and the OTC as well.
- Katherine Kelly had questions on Metro's process for future discussions and potential phase shifting of distribution funding. Appreciation of the information was given.
- Chris Deffebach concurred with Clackamas County in that Washington County project managers were not informed yet on this proposal so far. It was recommended that problem solving be the key issue in resolving this issue rather than the focus of rewards and penalties.
- Rachael Tupica provided past history with this issue, and confirmed that FHA was leaning heavily on ODOT to work with local agencies to avoid penalties. It has been identified as one of

the highest risks in projects failing to be completed when their obligated funds are not met on time. Encouragement was given to jurisdictions to work with the certification groups for information on the process.

- Joanna Valencia asked if there were other tools planned with this issue. Mr. Leybold reported that risk assessments on projects before awards made are being considered, pro-actively track project progress and status in timelines, communications between local agencies and Metro increased for data sharing, and working with ODOT on a new database with the MPOs.

10. Adjourn

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

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, April 5, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	04/05/2019	04/05/2019 TPAC Agenda	040519T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	3/28/2019	TPAC Work Program, as of 3/28/2019	040519T-02
3	Handout	N/A	Introduction to Environmental Justice Course by NTI	040519T-03
4	Handout	N/A	Agenda for Introduction to Environmental Justice Course	040519T-04
5	Memo	03/27/2019	TO:TPAC and Interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: March 2019 MTIP Monthly Submitted Amendments	040519T-05
6	Handout	03/26/2019	2021-2024 STIP First Draft 100% List – Region 1 All Roads Transportation Safety (ARTS) Program	040519T-06
7	Minutes	02/20/2019	Draft Minutes from TPAC Feb. 20, 2019 Meeting	040519T-07
8	Minutes	3/01/2019	Draft Minutes from TPAC March 1, 2019 Meeting	040519T-08
9	Resolution 19-4983	4/05/2019	Resolution 19-4983 for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP involving one project impacting SMART	040519T-09
10	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-4983	4/05/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-4983, 2018-21 MTIP	040519T-10
11	Staff Report	March 25, 2019	Staff Report to Resolution 19-4983, 2018-21 MTIP	040519T-11
12	Memo	March 29, 2019	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner RE: Request for TPAC action on 2019-21 UPWP	040519T-12
13	Resolution 19-4979	N/A	Resolution 19-4979 for the purpose of adopting the fiscal year 2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program	040519T-13
14	Staff Report	5/16/2019	Staff Report to Resolution 19-4979, Consideration of adoption of the UPWP	040519T-14
15	Draft UPWP, dated January 7, 2019	1/7/2019	Discussion Draft of the Unified Planning Work Program, Dated January 7, 2019	040519T-15
16	Memo	2/26/2019	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner RE: TransPort Bylaws Update	040519T-16

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
17	Handout	N/A	TransPort Subcommittee Bylaws, Draft 1	040519T-17
18	Memo	3/29/2019	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ted Leybold, Transportation Planning Manager RE: ODOT proposed funding obligation targets	040519T-18
19	Handout	April 2019	2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) project application instruction and guidance	040519T-19
20	Handout	N/A	2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Project Application	040519T-20
21	Handout	N/A	TransPort Subcommittee Bylaws, Draft2	040519T-21
22	Presentation	April 5, 2019	April 2019 Formal MTIP Amendment & Approval Request of Resolution 19-4983	040519T-22
23	Presentation	April 5, 2019	2019-20 Unified Planning Work Program	040519T-23
24	Presentation	April 5, 2019	Clackamas to Columbia Corridor (C2C) Plan	040519T-24
25	Presentation	April 5, 2019	MPO Obligation Targets	040519T-25