



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, Feb. 20, 2019 | 10 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Joanna Valencia
Chris Deffebach
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Jeff Owen
Phil Healy
Glenn Koehrsen
Beverly Drott

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
TriMet
Port of Portland
Community Representative
Community Representative

Alternates Attending

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair
Steve Williams
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Huff
Todd Juhasz
Jon Makler

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Beaverton and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Lynda David
Mark Lear
Don Odermott
Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Jason Gibbens
Rachael Tupica
Jennifer Campos
Tyler Bullen
Jessica Stetson
Maria Hernandez-Segoviano
Emily Lai

Affiliate

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative

Guests Attending

Garet Prior
Anna Slatinsky

Affiliate

City of Tualatin
City of Beaverton

Metro Staff Attending

Margi Bradway, Dep. Director, P&D Dept.
Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Daniel Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner

1. Call to Order, Welcome and Introductions

Chairman Tom Kloster called the special workshop meeting to order at 10 a.m. Introductions by members, staff and guests were made.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- Chairman Kloster reminded members that both the Oregon Metro UPWP and the Southwest Washington Regional Transportation Council (RTC) UPWP are now out for review. The Clark County Commission on Aging has published their 2018 annual report on transportation focus to aging, as is available at <https://www.rtc.wa.gov/>

- **Special Transportation Fund Allocation Update** (Jeff Owen, TriMet) Mr. Owen drew attention to a new handout presented at the meeting, a summary of Special Transportation Fund (STF) project list recommended by the STFAC (Advisory Committee) for funds. The handout presents projects by applications with their funding recommendations, totaling \$8,579,178 based on estimated funds available. The legislature may change or reduce these funds, and if so, the Advisory Committee will make reduced recommendations on allocations. The Board of Directors at TriMet will consider these recommendations at their next meeting. Project descriptions are available on the website, and any follow up questions can be directed to Mr. Owen.

Glenn Koehrsen passed out a handout titled “Older Adult Population Trends in Clackamas County”. Comparing this graph showing the population of adults 65 years and older growing from 11% in 200 to 21% in 2025, and the graph Mr. Owen presented in his materials STF Fund Revenue Sources, these funds have continued to decrease. Mr. Koehrsen commented on the increasing aging of our population where a great need for transit accessibility and reliability for medical, social and lifestyle needs will face more decrease of funds. Mr. Koehrsen acknowledged the work with RTP including these issues in the plan, and interest from the committee. In addition, Mr. Koehrsen announced there was a meeting on Feb. 22 at Ride Connection titled “Age-Friendly Transportation Roundtable” sponsored by AARP and others. The flyer was forwarded to committee members following the meeting.

- **Update on 2021-2024 MTIP Policy** (Grace Cho) Ms. Cho updated TPAC on the status of the 2021-2024 MTIP Policy Update. Since TPAC last met and provided input, staff incorporated this input into the draft that is now being presented to JPACT at their March meeting. At that time, action will be asked to approve the policy documents. These materials are online for review. Katherine Kelly appreciated having the opportunity to add input to the process.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items - none

4. 2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Policy Update Dan Kaempff presented information on the draft 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Policy to help guide selection of

investments this cycle. The 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) feedback from public and stakeholders provided four investment priorities: Equity, Safety, Climate Smart and Managing Congestion. RFFA policy would follow these priorities in determining the outcomes from investment of the regional funds. This relatively small amount of funding will focus on regional priorities, leverage additional funding, and fund elements of the regional system that don't have large sources of dedicated funding.

Current uses of RFFA funds are for Transportation System Management & Operations (TSMO), Regional Travel Options/Safe Routes to School (RTO/SRTS), Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), Corridor and system planning and MPO functions, and Capital project and project development (to expand transit networks, complete the active transportation network, and improve freight connections and/or arterial network).

The existing RFFA framework invests in these areas through a two-step process.

- Step 1 – Regional Commitments (Transit and project development bond payments, TOD, RTO, TSMO programs, corridor and system planning, MPO functions in lieu of dues)
- Step 2 – Capital Projects. Project development and construction funds for projects focusing on two specific areas: Active Transportation and Complete Street (75% of the Step 2 funds) and Regional Freight Initiatives (25%)

Mr. Kaempff showed a slide from the previous RFFA cycle (2019-21) that displayed the Step 1 and Step 2 investments, totaling \$126,330,000. The funding expected in the new cycle was not available but could be expected to increase between \$8-15 million over the last cycle. This would bring the estimated revenue for the 2022-24 cycle into the \$134-\$141 million range.

At the outset of the 2022-24 cycle, the Metro Council provided direction that the region should use the RTP priorities as the RFFA policy framework, carry out the four primary priorities through RFFA project selection, maintain the existing two-step funding framework, but look for better alignment of Step 2 investment areas to achieve outcomes with RTP priorities. Following providing policy development next steps with TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council, and explaining the additional handout at the meeting with implementation timeline, Mr. Kaempff asked for input from the committee on Step 2 criteria and direction with RTP priorities.

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler asked to include a third discussion added at the end of the two proposed by Mr. Kaempff, regarding process calendar.
- Jeff Owen asked to have “and reliability” added to page 6 of the Draft policy report, under the climate priority, to read “improving transit travel times and reliability”.
- Steve Williams, referring to attachment A, page 1, addressing the RTP priority of Safety – “reduce fatal and severe injury crashes, particularly focused on the High Crash Corridor network”, raised the question of Safety being added as a specific Step 2 category. He questioned how this would be implemented in this RFFA cycle. Mr. Kaempff replied that we are looking for ways to improve safety outcomes through the existing categories. Mr. Williams said it appeared the priority appears to be on high crash corridors, but not necessarily driven by

freight and active transportation. Were other issues being considered within these corridors? Mr. Leybold added that other investments for safety issues, such as ARTS project funding, outside of the RFFA funding policy framework are available to address safety issues outside of an active transportation and freight framework, and there has been no further direction for Metro staff to propose RFFA to go beyond these categories. Mr. Makler expressed concern with the reference that ARTS projects which don't compete well for all safety project's needs, identified by one example with Complete Streets issues. The concern is having ARTS project funding fall outside Federal measures to address specific safety issues.

Mr. Williams asked if there were any statistics that showed percentages of serious injury crashes directly related to active transportation and freight. Lake McTighe provided sources where these are reported. One was in the 2018 State of Safety Report that showed crash data by modes. Interactive maps online show overall data of high crashes in corridors for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists. A growing trend with rising fatalities concerns pedestrians regionally, statewide and nationally. Mr. Williams added all parts of the region have adopted some form of project safety action plan. Clackamas County has a long list of transportation safety projects addressing all modes. However, the ARTS funding may not fit these types of projects and locations. It was felt that Active Transportation and Freight was too limiting and advocated for a broader safety definition in the policy directive.

- Phil Healy commented on the Step 2 Capital Projects with roughly half of 1% of allocated funding to regional freight initiatives. It was suggested that freight projects that incorporate active transportation components in their projects might meet the requirements for further funding allocations in the two splits.
- Katherine Kelly commented on the need for further discussion with the two categories of Step 2. As an example, the City of Gresham had to submit 2 applications for the same project to address Complete Streets and Freight, stretching time and resources on staff and making evaluations challenging. While safety issues are important for projects, this adds more requirements to project design and classifications, and would suggest consideration of blurring the lines with the categories.

She also pointed out language on page 5 of attachment B, highlighted under Step 2 – Capital Investments, “This policy construct will continue in the 2022-2014 RFFA...” implies project focus area needs, priorities and project prioritization factors and developed direction have been discussed at TPAC. However, this policy discussion at TPAC has not taken place so far.

On page 7 of attachment B, specific criteria to identify arterial freight routes in the development of project planning does not appear to be named. It was suggested that since the policy framework was written before the RTP update adopted, the arterial freight maps be included in this criteria.

- Joanna Valencia agreed with Ms. Kelly on the difficulty fitting projects into categories as designed in the split. She encouraged more discussion and design for projects based on criteria, with the four investments prioritized by Metro Council (Equity, Safety, Climate and Congestion) as the base. Projects with emerging technology are not currently identified

specifically with criteria, which can help leverage projects in several categories. Ms. Valencia encouraged adding these concepts in the RTP performance targets that can go beyond the two Step 2 categories with further flexibilities of projects.

Ms. Valencia asked what the difference was between the primary and secondary criteria in project evaluations. Mr. Kaempff reported that the questions developed in the applications provide points weighted in strength for primary more than secondary points. Priority tiers are made in an attempt to tie these evaluations to policy.

- Glenn Koehrsen suggested that adding seniors as part of the primary criteria under Equity, page 6 of Attachment B would help identify the need that seniors have for access to services. This should be included in the primary criteria, not secondary. Mr. Koehrsen asked if consideration for transit service pilot programs with access for seniors fit in areas with these funds. Mr. Leybold reported that policy and eligibility issues challenge having new transit service funded with RFFA allocations. Pilot programs could be problematic due to funding cycles with unknown continuing resources for services, and are not tied to existing policy direction. In a question on difference between Safe Routes to Schools and First Mile, Last Mile access to transit, Mr. Kaempff reported that specific funds for SRTS addressed infrastructure that indirectly helped all transit routes, but was directed with criteria tied to the SRTS projects.
- Dayna Webb added her support of adding the elderly, young and persons with disabilities to the primary criteria under equity.
- Chris Deffebach commented on listing emerging technology only under Climate Smart with the RTP Investments Priorities. It would seem this tool could apply to all four priorities, and recommended a more broadly use among the categories. Page 5 of Attachment B lists recommended approach for developing projects with Active Transportation and Complete Street. Mr. Kaempff agreed and stated that it would be added to the criteria where relevant.

In discussion with the safety criteria with one or more proven safety countermeasures, Lake McTighe helped clarify countermeasures with interventions used to reduce crashes, used broadly in the language listed in criteria. Mr. Kaempff added that the level of safety described in projects, focused on reducing crashes, was not tied to question of eligibility to apply.

- Katherine Kelly agreed with the comments offered by Ms. Valencia. It was suggested that confusion could be eliminated if the 2-step policy framework was eliminated and focused on the RTP priorities categories. As Metro Council provided policy development with refinement of the 2-step framework, better alignments suggested at this meeting should be considered.

Attachment B, page 2 it states “Council indicated their intent for the RFFA policy to advance diversity through contracting opportunities associated with these funds”. Asked how in the selection process this would be achieved, Mr. Leybold stated these are not yet developed. Ms. Kelly suggested including more emerging technology methods and approaches in intermodal criteria listings, not only with freight but all modes of transportation.

- Jon Makler acknowledged the comments provided, and agreed with the importance of investments in freight projects that can seek to fund arterial access, safety and technology among the given 2-step split. Regarding seniors, youth and people with disabilities, equity addressed in the RTP related to the obligation to serve the underserved in our transportation system. It does not generally include those of seniors or SRTS programs. Mr. Makler suggested that equity projects in reference to RTP points toward funding dedicated to meet the needs of the historically underserved represented population of the region. Mr. Makler added that safety projects and climate smart projects should be addressed sooner rather than later. It was recommended that safety and equity be more directly addressed.
- Steve Williams agreed with the importance of the safety priorities, and discussion on eliminating the 2-step split, but acknowledged the pushback that might come from doing so. It would be recommended to name a broad range of projects that work around the two categories. Mr. Williams suggested the idea of fund swapping or exchange that could be used to de-federalize funds, which can limit funds to projects. Including this in the document for a stronger emphasis with the recommendation to JPACT was suggested.
- Eric Hesse acknowledged the discussion on the 2-step split and having flexibility developing project criteria that include both the policy intent and finding more broad integration for funds. It was asked if more specific criteria would be coming. Mr. Leybold stated that policy here is meant to provide policy framework structure, which will go into the application. The measures to evaluate the criteria in technical scores will be included in the application. More evaluation includes project risk assessment, public comment, and coordinating committee input per policy direction.

Mr. Hesse commented on the access measures included in the RTP, and suggested these be tied to the access criteria in developing technologies. References on page 7 of Attachment B with capital investments to access industrial lands and regional freight network systems, emphasis on economic significance was recommended. Mr. Leybold added that staff is working with the Economic Value Atlas staff to see if this tool can be implemented for such purpose. Mr. Hesse appreciated Mr. Makler's comments on confirming RTP policy framework. It was suggested to expand the climate smart criteria to include technology development with complete streets and safety projects.

Chris Deffebach suggested that in addressing the challenges with the 2-step split, the application provided a method to identify projects that cross over criteria with more possible emphasis on funding, and why this would be considered. It was asked when applications for RFFA funds would be open for application. Mr. Kaempff stated this would open in early April.

- Ms. Deffebach commented on the challenges applying for defederalized funded projects. It was asked what defined these opportunities and how best to apply for them. Mr. Leybold stated that TriMet has offered to again consider exchanging funds to the limits of their ability to use federal funds. In the current cycle, four projects requested and received local funds in exchange for federal. He acknowledged the challenges to apply for these funds with administrative work and impacts for implementing. Metro will try to start the process earlier with more information on the programs.

- Katherine Kelly acknowledged the challenges reconciling the policy framework with the 2-step split. She encouraged flexibility in working toward eliminating the two categories and focusing on RTP priorities overall, where projects carry over several priorities and include job access points, freight facilities and arterials, safety projects and more.
- Jon Makler referenced the 2022-2024 RFFA Policy Update and Implementation Timeline. With other program deadlines occurring in the same timeline period (STIP, Safety and ARTS projects, among others), it was suggested coordination with these projects be highlighted and known. It was also suggested that a template be designed with standards for cost estimates on scoping of projects. Included in this are inflation elements that affect project costs (labor, design, construction) among others. A workgroup could be formed to create and develop these forms. Mr. Kaempff added that Metro has hired a consulting firm to address scoping and cost estimates with projects, which will be used in guidance with call to projects in RFFA. The opportunity to share this input in the application will be provided.
- Jeff Owen asked what the timeframe was for the application period. Mr. Kaempff reported this for early April to early June, roughly 2 months.
- Glenn Koehrsen asked if an example of a past application could be provided to the committee. Chairman Kloster agreed this would be sent out to the members by Marie Miller.

5. 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, February 20, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	02/20/2019	02/20/2019 TPAC Agenda	022019T-01
2	Memo	1/04/2019	TO: Special Transportation Fund Agencies From: H.A.Gard, ODOT Rail and Public Transit Division Administrator RE: 2019-2021 Special Transportation Fund Estimates	022019T-02
3	Memo	1/11/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Vanessa Vissar, TriMet RE: Grants Available for Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities	022019T-03
4	Handout	2/01/2019	Summary STF, 5310, & STIF E&D Requests in alphabetical order	022019T-04
5	Memo	02/15/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: DRAFT 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Policy Development	022019T-05
6	Memo: Attachment A	01/18/2019	Attachment A – 2-20-19 RFFA Policy Development TO: Metro Council From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Response to Council Work Session on 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation	022019T-06
7	Attachment B	February 2019	Attachment B – 2-20-19 RFFA Policy Development	022019T-07
8	Handout	N/A	Resolution 19-02-08, Exhibit A (TriMet) FY20-21 Biennium Special Transportation Fund and Section 5310, FY19-21 STIF Human Services transportation	022019T-08
9	Handout	N/S	Older Adult Population Trends in Clackamas County	022019T-09
10	Handout	2/14/2019	2022-2024 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Policy Update and Implementation Timeline	022019T-10
11	Handout	N/A	Age-Friendly Transportation Roundtable: Meeting the Transportation Needs of Older Adults and People with Disabilities	022019T-11
12	Presentation	2/20/2019	DRAFT 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Policy	022019T-12