



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, November 1, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Jessica Berry
Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Don Odermott
Jeff Owen
Melanie Ware
Tom Bouillion
Tyler Bullen
Glenn Koehrsen
Jessica Stetson
Maria Hernandez-Segoviano
Beverly Drottar

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas 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
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Jaimie Huff
Chris Strong
Garet Prior
Glen Bolen
Karen Williams

Affiliate

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
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Members Excused

Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Laurie Lebowsky
Emily Lai
Rachael Tupica
Jennifer Campos
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Cullen Stephenson

Affiliate

Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Community Representative
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver, Washington
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Lidwien Rahman
Scott Turnoy
Kari Schlosshauer
Jean Senechal Biggs
John Sothegin

Affiliate

Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership
City of Beaverton
City of Gladstone

Metro Staff Attending

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner	Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Eliot Rose, Senior Tech & Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner	Ted Leybold, Planning & Development Resource Mgr.
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner	John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner	Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Valeria Vidal, Associate Management Analyst	Walle Brown, Planning & Development Intern
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder	

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

Chairman Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was declared of members present. Introductions were made.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck)
Ken Lobeck provided an update on the September/October 2019 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) monthly submitted amendments. The memo in the packet provides a summary of October 2019 submitted formal amendments, and MTIP Sept/Oct. 2019 Administrative Modifications project lists. For questions or further information the committee is asked to contact Mr. Lobeck.
- **Transportation Policy & Funding Map** (Garet Prior)
Garet Prior presented a handout, 'Transportation Policy and Funding Framework' that laid out levels between state, region, county and city agencies with boards/committees. Each were linked to policy or plans, types of funding decision makers with tasks, with acronyms spelled out for explained definitions to councils, committees and public. Mr. Prior offered to share the Publisher file with committee members and accept further edits and ideas to expand the framework map. It was noted to change TPAC to Alternate from Advisory committee. TPAC members acknowledged the work on the map and usefulness for resources.
- **2021-2024 MTIP Network Review and Data Request for No Build Update** (Grace Cho)
Grace Cho thanked the jurisdictions who submitted data on projects requested for the 2021-2024 MTIP and No Build list. A few more reports are pending for submissions. Ms. Cho will be in contact for those directly so that they are include in the TIP analysis and base work in early 2020. For questions or more information the committee is asked to contact Ms. Cho.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items

- Jeff Owen noted the new fresh Red Paint project around the region, provided by the City of Portland and TriMet, which provides priority space for buses and streetcar. This was recently given media coverage.

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from October 4, 2019

MOTION: To approve the minutes from October 4, 2019, as presented.

Moved: Jeff Owen

Seconded: Eric Hesse

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

5. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 19-5046

Ken Lobeck presented information on the November 2019 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment bundle (for FFY 2020) that contains required changes and updates impacting Metro, ODOT, Portland and Tigard. Eight projects comprise the amendment bundle, summarized.

3 projects being cancelled from the MTIP:

- **Key 21038** – Metro: Regional TSMO Program (2017)
 - UPWP funding supporting Metro staff
 - Obligated against a different UPWP project
 - Duplicate project in the MTIP
- **Keys 20809 & 20817** – Portland:
 - Central Eastside Intersection Improvements
 - NE 72nd Ave: NE Killingsworth – NE Sandy Blvd
 - Local fund exchange project among Metro, Portland and TriMet
 - De-federalized: Local IGA developed & executed.
 - Monitored by Metro & delivered as a locally funded project
 - No federal approvals: MTIP programming not required
 - Cancellation reflects only MTIP programming

3 projects involving major scope changes:

- **Key 20451** – ODOT: **OR8 at River Rd & OR224 at Lake Rd**
 - OR224 at Lake Rd removed from scope due to budget constraints
 - Scope removed: **Replace overhead flasher with ground mounted advance flashers at the intersection of OR224 and Lake Rd**
 - Revised scope: **Full signal upgrade with illumination and ADA improvements at the intersection of OR8 and River Rd**
 - Total project cost (TPC) remains unchanged at \$2,649,465
- **Key 20208** – ODOT: **US30 Kittridge – St Johns NW Saltzman Rd – NW Bridge Ave**
 - Project limits reduced due to budget constraints
 - Bridge Ave planned improvements eliminated including paving
 - ADA upgrades require signal rebuilds not originally considered part of the project
 - TPC remains unchanged at \$8,518,704
- **Key 20334** – Portland: **Systemic Signal and Illumination** (ODOT ARTS Funded)
 - Reduced scope to fit within budget constraint.
 - 4 locations removed from scope:
 - ARTS ID #9: 92nd Ave: Powell - Woodstock
 - ARTS ID #14: W Burnside Rd: Uptown Terrace - 48th Ave
 - ARTS ID #20H: NE Halsey St at NE 122nd Ave
 - ARTS ID #34H: SE Stark St at SE 148th Ave
 - Total project cost (TPC) remains unchanged at \$1,859,554

1 project with a significant cost increase:

- **Key 19327** – Tigard: **Fanno Creek Trail - Woodward Pk to Bonita Rd/85th Ave – Tualatin Bridge**
Cost increase to Construction phase
Adding \$1.5 million local funds to address construction phase shortfall
Total project cost increases to \$6,404,977

1 new planning study being added (I-5 Columbia River (Interstate) Bridge)

- **Key 21570** – ODOT: **I-5 Columbia River (Interstate) Bridge**
[Adding a new project to the MTIP](#)
Complete multi-modal planning assessment activities for a replacement Interstate 5 bridge between Oregon and Washington
Funding source = Annual Redistribution allocation
OTC approval during their August 2019 Meeting
Cooperative effort with WSDOT

MOTION: To provide approval recommendation to JPACT of Resolution 19-5046, for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP involving eight projects impacting Metro, ODOT, Portland, and Tigard, and direct staff to make all necessary corrections to amendment documents.

Moved: Glenn Koehrsen

Seconded: Jessica Stetson

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

6. Regional Mobility Policy Work Plan and Engagement Plan (Kim Ellis, Metro/Lidwien Rahman, ODOT)

Kim Ellis provided an overview of the material in the packet that started with her memo and attachments, including the draft work plan (attachment 4) and draft stakeholder and public engagement plan (attachment 5). A broader scoping report is currently being finalized and will be completed next week. This can be viewed online or requested to be sent to committee members.

The proposed Regional Mobility Work Plan will lead to amendments and updates toward the next RTP update scheduled in late 2021, and OTC recommendations on the State Highway Plan. Ms. Ellis reported on next steps with the plans, briefing Metro Council, JPACT and Council consideration through the end of 2019, with consultant work in the IGA early in the next year.

The yellow sheet handout, Proposed Amendment for TPAC consideration, was explained by Melanie Ware, ODOT. The proposed added language was designed to provide decisions makers and OTC with clarification on the wording and purpose of statewide functions on freeways and arterials recognized with the Regional Mobility Policy updates in the work plan.

Comments from the committee:

- Chris Deffebach asked where in the plan measurements were evaluated with possible implications and how to apply them regionally. Ms. Ellis noted attachment 4, page 9, task 7 with Conduct Case Study Analysis and Prepare Finds, and page 8, task 2 with Illustrate Current Approaches (Strengths and Weaknesses). Noting that ratio measurements vary by different standards around the region, the work plan hopes to have input from the committee to help shape the implications. Ms. Deffebach recommended having more documentation and engagement beyond workshops, so that the action plan that follows the work plan ties directly to different regional differences and applications with the plan.

- Karen Buehrig appreciated the work done with the plan. It would be helpful in the near-term to provide more details on how TPAC will be engaged, given that local jurisdictions will be implementing these plans. Ms. Ellis agreed on the increased touchpoints with TPAC on further engagement and noted a full calendar scheduled with the county coordinating committees.
- Don Odermott commented on the positive direction with the plan. It was noted that the system included an integrated system with technical engineers involved in the process, which is helpful to have built into the model.
- Maria Hernandez-Segoviano commented on the need to adapt these policy updates for all types of mobility across the region, with some type of baseline measurement that provides outcomes. It was recommended that these be named Regional Equitable Mobility plans. Referring to attachment 2, Scoping Factsheet, it was clearly defined as current policy lacked achieving goals in equity, development and housing production, affordable travel options, and the importance of a final regional mobility policy that should advance multiple outcomes for the system, such as goals around safety, racial equity and climate. It was encouraged to include more ridership experts in the engagement process to provide more transit coverage in areas needed.
- Eric Hesse appreciated the efforts on the plan, and noted the balance between jurisdictions and local perspectives that recognized the impacts on development reviews that are critical to outcome success. It was noted the current policies sometimes limit capabilities, but the City of Portland offers to share input on long-range planning for regional alignment consideration and study, and is interested in exploring inputs/outputs with others across the region.
- Karen Williams noted the increased travel with more congestion and impacts to air quality. Several places in the stakeholder interview report suggested looking to findings in California that use VMT measurements to provide mobility outcomes and climate changes. How would incorporating these into measurements in the report result in outcomes, and could expand the criteria beyond greenhouse emissions be incorporated in the work plan. Ms. Ellis noted the work with Robert Liberty and PSU that can give us both system and planning level understanding, which will be brought to TPAC next year.

Ms. Ellis noted the interest and connection beyond air quality studies in our system evaluations. Public health agencies are involved in this process, but not all measurements of the 27 listed in the current RTP are tied directly to the Mobility Plan. Lidwien Rahman added that measurements will not be added to the Mobility Policy Plan, but can give direction to local jurisdictions to find tradeoffs and solutions on acceptable approaches and plans that address completeness to access, reliability and equitable transit options from the document of the plans' evaluations and outcomes. Chairman Kloster thanked the committee for its input and support with the development of the work plan and further work ahead.

MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT of the draft Regional Mobility Update Work Plan and draft Engagement Plan, including the proposed amendments presented at this meeting.

Moved: Don Odermott

Seconded: Melanie Ware

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

- 7. Proposed Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendments and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendments** (John Mermin & Ken Lobeck, Metro/Scott Turnoy, ODOT)
Chairman Kloster provided an overview of the four proposed resolutions listed with this agenda item. Two amendments were being proposed to be added to the 2019-20 UPWP; a bundle of three projects

added to the UPWP (Clackamas Corridor Management, Emerging Technology and Boone Bridge projects), and an existing project that is receiving increased funding to advance work up to the current UPWP fiscal year (ODOT's Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study 2), CBOS2.

In addition, MTIP amendments for both UPWP amendments were being presented for discussion. Chairman Kloster noted the distinction of the UPWP vs MTIP amendments plans; the UPWP amendments add the planning activities to our work plan, and the MTIP amendments enable the money to be spent. TPAC is being asked to discuss and be informed at this meeting, and will be asked to take action on recommendation to JPACT at the December TPAC meeting.

John Mermin passed out the staff report on Resolution 19-5047 that was inadvertently left out of the packet, which explains details on the three project bundle being amended and added to the UPWP. In summary:

Clackamas Connections Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) project

Major highways in Clackamas County are often pushed to their limit during times of peak congestion. This project will develop the concept for operations for corridor-specific Transportation System Management and Operations (TSMO) to improve real-time freeway and arterial travel by developing a Concept of Operations that integrates agencies operationally, institutionally and technologically. This includes TSMO strategies for better traveler information, smarter traffic signals and more effective incident response. Corridors subject to the initial phase of needs analysis will be sections of Interstates 5 and along Interstate 205, Wilsonville Road, Elligsen Road, Stafford Road, 65th Avenue, Borland Road, Willamette Falls Drive, 82nd Drive/Avenue, McLoughlin Boulevard (99E) and Highway 224 in Clackamas County. The project will be beneficial for freight drivers as they make route decisions to reach destinations in the region and beyond. It will also make use of the region's transit investments, improving operations through integrated Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).

Emerging Technology Implementation Study

Over the past five years, emerging technologies like ride-hailing, micro mobility, and electric vehicles have changed how people get around the Portland area. Metro is responsible for long-term transportation planning in the Portland region, and we need to take into account the impacts that emerging technology has on our transportation system. Metro's 2018 update to the Regional Transportation Plan included an Emerging Technology Strategy that identified how Metro and our partner agencies can harness new developments in transportation technology to make our region more equitable and livable. The Strategy created a policy framework for emerging technology, but it did not go into much detail in identifying implementation actions for transportation agencies across the region due to a lack of available data, a dearth of relevant best practices, and uncertainty in the technology sector.

The Emerging Technology Implementation Study will identify near-term opportunities for public agencies in the region to ensure that emerging technology benefits their communities, including projects, programs, regulations, policies, and follow-up planning activities. The Study will identify how, when, and where to apply different strategies by drawing on newly-available data and research on emerging technology and on lessons learned from technology pilot projects in the Portland area and peer regions. It will provide information and practical guidance that Metro's agency partners can use to better plan for and manage new developments in technology.

I-5 Boone Bridge Widening / Seismic Retrofit and Interchange Improvement Study

The study builds on the I-5 Wilsonville Facility Plan, adopted in July 2018. In HB 5050 the 2019 Legislature directed ODOT to study widening and seismically retrofitting the I-5 Boone Bridge. On August 15, 2019 the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) approved \$300,000 in FHWA funds toward the development of a report that will further evaluate the I-5 Boone Bridge widening and interchange improvements between Wilsonville Road and the Canby-Hubbard Highway.

The study will:

- Identify a range of costs to achieve a widened and resilient I-5 Boone Bridge.
- Determine if it is structurally feasible to widen and seismically retrofit the existing I-5 Boone Bridge and identify associated planning level cost range and risks.
- Identify cost range and risks to replace the I-5 Boone Bridge.
- Identify cost range associated with interchange improvements on I-5 in the study area.
- Identify further analysis and associated costs necessary following this study

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig noted that Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5047, the Clackamas Connections Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) project being entered into the UPWP was a shift in project management to Clackamas County. It was also noted that FY 2019-20 Cost and Funding Sources listed with the project should reflect funding source changes, with \$55,000 less from Clackamas County and that amount of Federal funding added to the project. Mr. Mermin noted this would be reflected in the updated draft when presented to the committee in Dec.
- Chris Deffebach asked if these projected reflected money already budgeted in the UPWP or additional funds for projects. Chairman Kloster reported these were new federal funds. Vice Chairman Ted Leybold added that the TSMO projects were from past allocated funds, with the newly identified ICM project coming from the last round of projects with TSMO. The project is still determining lead agency, budget and scope of the project. The Boone Bridge project is new federal funding identified by OTC with regional significance, allocating planning funds corresponding to MTIP funding already known. The Emerging Technology project is existing funds being transferred to this new project.

Mr. Mermin described the proposed UPWP amendment for Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study 2 (CBOS2). From the staff report:

ODOT's 2013 Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study (CBOS) identifies key congestion locations along the five Portland metro area freeway corridors (I-5, I-205, I-84, I-405 and U.S. 26). The study recommends projects to improve freeway safety and operations. The first CBOS study was completed in response to the Federal Highway Administration FHWA Localized Bottleneck Reduction (LBR) program. The federal program focused on relieving bottlenecks and their causes with the ultimate goal of improving safety and operations at these bottlenecks.

ODOT's 2013 Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study recommended cost-effective and smaller scale improvements to the existing system, and are intended to address congestion at identified bottlenecks, particularly during the peak commute shoulder hours (the hours before and after the traditional rush hour traffic pattern). These typically involve improvements to improve the operation of freeway ramps, add auxiliary lanes to improve merging and safety, and optimize freeway signage, speeds and signals.

Projects from the first CBOS that provided the best value of benefits and cost (primarily projects in

the \$1-20 million range) were selected for funding. Most of these projects have now been constructed by ODOT, and CBOS 2 seeks to continue this program of investments for the purpose of improving freeway safety and operations.

Scott Turnoy referred to the edited version of Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5052, ODOT Region 1 Planning for Operations, which addresses the refinement work currently being completed on the project. This proposed amendment adds budget to the refinement work ending June 30, 2020. ODOT will seek the project extended in the next UPWP for 2020-21 with more project refinement.

Comments from the committee:

- Jeff Owen asked for clarification on the FY 2019-20 Cost and Funding Sources with the project. Mr. Turnoy noted that additional funding was coming from FHWA, those funds already in the STIP, and match funding from State.
- Eric Hesse encouraged more discussion with these issues as they relate to UPWP, MTIP and RTP, and will help clarify projects and funding for JPACT consideration and decisions. It was noted that OTC already approved the funds for these projects, which must be included in the MTIP at accept funds for projects.

8. Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) (Dan Kaempff, Metro)

Dan Kaempff provided an overview of two RFFA project package approaches and asked TPAC input on further development of draft recommendation for December TPAC discussion and action. A review of policy direction and investment priorities with technical analysis was given. The risk assessment evaluated relative degree of risk to delivering project on time, within budget, and per application scope. Updated information from three applicants on how they will mitigate identified risk factors was included in the packet. Public comments provided strength of support with projects, which is reported online.

Mr. Kaempff noted the coordinating committees will help further round out information to TPAC, with priorities due the week of Nov. 18. It was noted that allocation objectives included investments be provided throughout the region, ensuring a sufficient number of CMAQ eligible projects were included, and consideration of other leveraged funding when possible and projects achieving multiple outcomes.

Two options were provided for discussion, based on TPAC input and technical ratings, both following the 75/25 targets, but taking different approaches to using Freight category funding, needing further adjustments to balance to funding targets, and used as starting points for development of recommendation.

Option 1: 75/25 + Technical Rating

- Considers projects in their self-identified category
- Places Multnomah County projects in Freight category
- Enough to fully fund 12 projects
- \$961K remaining in unallocated funds

Option 2: 75/25 + Technical Rating with additional Freight projects

- Considers Freight benefits of 5 additional projects from AT category (category changed to both)
- Prioritized some higher rated projects
- Enough to fully fund 14 projects

- \$2.6 million remaining in unallocated funds

The materials in the packet were described that included details of options 1 and 2, the project evaluation information summary, and project information details.

Comments from the committee:

- Jessica Berry noted the reason Multnomah County applied for projects in both categories (Active Transportation and Freight) as they provide significant improvements for bicycle/ped on Freight routes. On the technical committee level, east Multnomah County has concerns around these two projects, with more discussion on the Division project internally and policy discussion with committee meetings planned in Nov. Option 1 gives the County both projects funded, but Option 2 might allow the Division project higher priority for funding. Given this, with more input yet from the coordinating committee, the County is comfortable with Option 2 that helps Division with forecast value in the project.
- Katherine Kelly commented on the technical ratings questions had a baseline to begin evaluation, and if these were the right questions. It would be helpful to understand how the coordinating committee's input will be used to evaluate project ratings and priorities. Further clarification on risk assessment was asked. It was asked if removing scope or budget from project development, how this impacts evaluations. Certification from project agencies to project delivery was noted. It was suggested to use just the past round project certification and adding more assessment to this factor.

Mr. Kaempff noted that these questions raised on how the information can be used to provide priorities, levels of risk assessment and technical ratings would help TPAC compare project merits and provide direction on the committees' recommendation to JPACT. Ms. Kelly recommended a one-page description from each project using a standard template as was used last time that would be helpful in this evaluation of project. Mr. Kaempff noted he would look into this possibility.

- Garet Prior commented on the City of Tualatin's preference for option 2. Regarding the Sherwood project possibly funded through remaining funds with the option, although it received lower policy ranking, it might not have captured safety issue concerns, and possible leveraged public funding with private development in Washington County getting ahead of safety policies in future planned projects. The importance of system connectedness noted in the Regional Mobility Policy discussions with the Sherwood project, along with other Freight considerations should be included. Regarding public engagement, Washington County showed a low number of feedbacks (12%) to their projects; yet make up 34% of the region. The Aloha project was the only project to receive no concerns and scored high with meeting equity and safety factors. Further edits to these options from the discussion can help clarify the ratings.
- Karen Buehrig commented on the importance with input from the county coordinating committees in the process for their local knowledge and where potential investments can be leveraged or matched for projects. They might also provide options to possible project swaps with knowledge across the county and cities is being developed. Ms. Buehrig noted that Clackamas County has all project applicants providing a 11x17 project template designed to compare data to each other which is helpful for planning committees and county decision makers. It was noted how close the policy rating scores were with each project, making tough decisions on where investments will be made in the region. It was recommended the

evaluations of projects start with the policy ratings and scores first with further evaluations to follow. For Clackamas County option 2 was preferred.

- Chris Deffebach commented on option 2 capturing most of previous discussions, especially helpful with the addition to Active Transportation with Freight projects. Washington County coordinating committee will soon meet, and provide their information to JPACT. It was asked how this would be brought to TPAC in December. Mr. Kaempff noted it could be from one staff recommendation, or several recommendations that could develop for the final recommendation to JPACT. The importance on project evaluations with Washington County was also noted to further leverage investments across the county and region.
- Maria Hernandez-Segoviano commented on the four policy areas for evaluations (equity, safety, climate, and congestion) and how these projects were being highlighted or scored to match these value goals across the region. Noting option 2 would leave \$2.6 million remaining in unallocated funds, it was asked what defined project readiness and how approach to projects could better provide more details to readiness when funds are available to move them forward. It would be helpful to hear the evaluations from county coordinating committees which will provide input for a complete recommendation to JPACT in Dec.
- Eric Hesse appreciated the comments heard from TPAC with policy framework as the start for discussion, and added input for a fully balanced evaluation for recommendation to JPACT. One-page evaluations used previously might be useful but should be balanced with all factors, which is challenging given that these factors are not equally weighted. Option 2 seems to be a good pathway for direction for utilizing fundable projects.
- Jeff Owen asked if all the county coordinating committees would have their feedback to JPACT when they met this month. Mr. Kaempff reported all would have responses to JPACT with their project priorities but possibly not in full detail.
- Katherine Kelly commented on the priority values matched to projects and not seeing these displayed in the technical analysis. Ms. Kelly reiterated that the Division Street project had been identified as a regional priority. Coordinating committees should weigh in with priorities at JPACT, which could be challenging when next TPAC meets to form the final recommendation, but can be taken into consideration at both levels.
- Karen Buehrig extended an invitation to attend the Clackamas County coordinating committee meeting, noting that materials from the meeting will be posted online, and the 3-minute presentations on each project were very helpful in understanding each project. Ms. Buehrig recommended bringing back 2 options to TPAC in Dec. that implement the coordinating committee recommendations rather than just one recommendation for further discussion.
- Chris Deffebach added an invitation to attend the Washington County coordinating committee meetings. Locating the one-pagers online, it was noted more specific details should be included for evaluation.
- Garet Prior suggested more information from equity factors with the engagement plan to highlight differences with people of color and people of low income in their responses. The use of data can be more fully utilized.

9. Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guide (Lake McTighe, Metro)

Lake McTighe provided an overview of the finalized new Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guide. Noted in the packet was the memo on background and process for the project, the link to the guide on the Metro website, the project timeline, and list of Design Technical work group members. On screen was a thank you to this group and TPAC for their input and participation. Ms. McTighe noted this was a regional effort in the development of this project.

Sections of the Guide's website were reviewed. Parts of this included the photo library which is publicly accessible for photo sharing, renderings of streets which can be downloaded and used for other documents, info graphics being added, and links to other guides, community stories and case studies. The Guide will be printed in limited copies to share with TPAC soon. It can also be downloaded and printed from the website.

Comments from the committee:

- Katherine Kelly commented on the great work with the guide. It was suggested to highlight additions to street designs with emerging technology.
- Jeff Owen added appreciation to the project including the availability of sharing photos.

10. Committee Feedback on Creating a Safe Space at TPAC

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

- Consider making an optional handout (optional projecting) a list of acronyms and definitions. Think about categorizing, too. Good for guests and new members to have.
Example: Funding- CMAQ Project- UPWP Plans – RTP
- What opportunities are there for public comments at TPAC? This would have the opportunity open to public attending in person to speak on issues and good to make the process more inclusive. It was noted this agenda item was overlooked for the meeting, but paid more attention to this next time.

11. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kloster at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, November 1, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	11/01/2019	11/01/2019 TPAC Agenda	110119T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	10/25/2019	TPAC Work Program, as of 10/25/2019	110119T-02
3	Memo	10/25/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: Sept./Oct. 2019 MTIP Monthly Submitted Amendments	110119T-03
4	Handout	N/A	Transportation Policy & Funding Framework	110119T-04
5	Minutes	10/04/2019	Draft Minutes from TPAC October 4, 2019 Meeting	110119T-05
6	Resolution 19-5046	11/01/2019	Resolution 19-5046 for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP involving eight projects impacting Metro, ODOT, Portland and Tigard	110119T-06
7	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5046	11/01/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5046, 2018-21 MTIP	110119T-07
8	Staff Report	10/24/2019	Staff Report to Resolution 19-5046, 2018-21 MTIP	110119T-08
9	Memo	10/24/2019	To: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Kim Ellis, Metro Project Manager and Lidwien Rahman, ODOT Project Manager RE: Regional Mobility Policy Update Work Plan and Engagement Plan	110119T-09
10	Resolution 19-5047	11/01/2019	Resolution 19-5047 for the purpose of amending the FY 2019-20 UPWP to add funding for the Clackamas Corridor Management, Emerging Technology and Boone Bridge Projects	110119T-10
11	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5047	11/01/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5047, Clackamas Connections Integrated Corridor Management (ICM)	110119T-11
12	Exhibit B to Resolution 19-5047	11/01/2019	Exhibit B to Resolution 19-5047, Emerging Technology Implementation Study	110119T-12
13	Exhibit C to Resolution 19-5047	11/01/2019	Exhibit C to Resolution 19-5047, Interstate 5: Boone Bridge Widening/Seismic Retrofit and Interchange Improvements Study	110119T-13
14	Staff Report to Resolution 19-5047	10/25/2019	Staff Report to Resolution 19-5047, Nov. 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment & Approval Request of Boone Bridge Project Study	110119T-14

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
15	Staff Report Memo	10/25/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: Dec. 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment & Approval Request for Resolution 19-50XX, CBOS 2 Study	110119T-15
16	Memo	10/25/2019	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner RE: Proposed 2019-20 UPWP Amendment for Corridor Bottleneck Operations Study 2 (CBOS2)	110119T-16
17	Memo	10/25/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Package Approaches	110119T-17
18	Memo	10/23/2019	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Regional Transportation Planner RE: Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guide	110119T-18
19	Handout	N/A	Attachment 1: Link to Designing Livable Streets and Trail Guide	110119T-19
20	Handout	04/05/2019	Attachment 2: Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guide Project Timeline	110119T-20
21	Handout	N/A	Attachment 3: Roster for Design Technical Work Group	110119T-21
22	Handout	10/23/2019	Proposed Amendment for TPAC Consideration: Metro/ODOT Mobility Policy Update Work Plan	110119T-22
23	Staff Report	10/25/2019	Updated Staff Report in Consideration of Resolution 19-5047	110119T-23
24	Resolution 19-5052	11/01/2019	Resolution 19-5052 for the purpose of amending the FY 2019-20 UPWP to add funding for the Corridor Bottleneck Operation Study 2 (CBOS 2) Project	110119T-24
25	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5052	11/01/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5052 ODOT Region 1 Planning for Operations	110119T-25
26	Handout	11/01/2019	2022-24 RFFA Project Evaluation Option 1	110119T-26
27	Handout	11/01/2019	2022-24 RFFA Project Evaluation Option 2	110119T-27
28	Handout	11/01/2019	2022-24 RFFA Project Evaluation Project Information Summary	110119T-28
29	Handout	11/01/2019	2022-24 RFFA Project Evaluation Project Information Detail	110119T-29
30	Presentation	11/01/2019	November 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment Summary	110119T-30

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
31	Presentation	11/01/2019	2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation	110119T-31
32	Presentation	11/01/2019	Thank you technical work group!	110119T-32