

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**
Date/time: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 | 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Shawn Donaghy

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Happy Valley & Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation
C-Tran System

Alternates Attending

Steve Williams
Mark Lear
Dayna Webb
Mike McCarthy
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen
Gerik Kransky

Affiliate

Clackamas County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Members Excused

Chris Deffebach
Lynda David
Eric Hesse
Don Odermott
Karen Williams
Lewis Lem
Idris Ibrahim
Jasmine Harris
Katherine Kelly
Rob Klug
Jeremy Borrego
Rich Doenges

Affiliate

Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Port of Portland
Community Member
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Clark County
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Cody Field
Dave Farmer
Dave Roth

Affiliate

City of Tualatin

City of Tigard

Guests Attending-cont.

Jean Senechal Biggs
Jessica Pelz
Matthew Hall
Matthew Pahs
Mel Krnjaic Hogg
Nick Fortey
Steve Kelley

Affiliate

City of Beaverton
Washington County
WSP
FHWA, WA
PBOT
FHWA, OR
Washington County

Metro Staff Attending

Alex Oreschak, Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Dan Kaempff, Eliot Rose, Jodie Kotrlik, John Mermin, Kate Hawkins, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Madeline Steele, Marie Miller, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Molly Cooney-Mesker, Summer Blackhorse, Ted Leybold, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. The link for providing ‘safe space’ at the meeting was shared in the chat area.

Updates from committee members around the Region

Tara O’Brien announced the TriMet Board of Directors was meeting tomorrow. Items on the agenda included hearing revisions to the Forward Together Network concept plan where public comment has been incorporated into. This is part of the service planning process for next year. An update will be given on their transit-oriented development plan with approval, a report on the STIP funding for the next biennium, and consideration of a fare increase starting in 2024. Public outreach on this has begun.

Public communications on agenda items – none received

Overview of 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Schedule and Call for Projects Process (Kim Ellis)

A brief overview of the timeline and process for Call for Projects was presented. The committee was asked to continue work to develop the technical and financial assumptions needed to complete the Call for Projects with draft revenue forecast and project list cost targets, and High-level assessment of projects. Reviewed was the timeline of the RTP, the reminder of deadlines with Call for Projects with resources and tools to support partners in the Call for Projects.

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear noted we will be expected to explain these project cost increases and would like to know where we point for information to highlight this. Ms. Ellis noted that Metro could put something together with our Communications team help. If you have something you need to communicate with your elected officials, please reach out to Metro for this. Mr. Lear noted this information applies to everything with implications on projects and budgets. In addition to the 40% increase just getting us to the current year, there are other percentage changes planned. It would be beneficial to have the big picture shown for understanding. Ms. Ellis noted FHWA requires we do this in expenditure dollars, which can be included in the materials. The submission guideline helps to show this as well.

Draft 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Revenue Forecast Assumptions (Ted Leybold) Mr.

Leybold described the methods used to create the draft transportation revenue forecast and the

creation of draft cost targets for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Call for Projects. The draft forecast provides an estimate of how much funding can be reasonably expected to be available during the life of the plan (2023-2045) both for capital projects and for maintaining and operating the existing transportation system. Financial assumptions for the RTP revenue forecast are being developed in cooperation with staff from cities, counties, and transportation agencies. The RTP revenue forecast will include revenues raised at the federal, state and local levels for transportation projects and programs to be included or accounted for in the 2023 RTP.

The statewide forecast provided anticipated distribution of federal and state revenues that are distributed by formulas to Oregon local agencies, transit agencies and ODOT at a statewide scale, utilizing current funding levels, historic growth rates and historic or anticipated distribution rates. Metro staff then worked with ODOT financial staff to forecast how much of those formula funds were reasonable to assume as available to the Metro area utilizing the same methodological criteria as the statewide forecast.

Discretionary federal funding (funding from competitive grant processes) was also provided by the statewide forecast for Oregon. Federal Highway Administration discretionary grants were forecasted to be awarded at the statewide level to be 50% awarded to local agencies and 50% to ODOT. Again, Metro staff worked with ODOT staff to forecast how much of these funds was reasonable to forecast would flow to the Metro area. However, each MPO has the flexibility to identify specific projects that are expected to be nationally competitive in targeted federal grant programs and forecast those funds as reasonably available.

Three projects are forecasted to receive funding from specific Federal Highway Administration discretionary awards:

- I-5 Interstate Bridge Replacement Program (\$1.5 billion),
- I-5/Rose Quarter (\$250 million placeholder), and
- Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge (\$500 million).

ODOT and Multnomah County will need to demonstrate during the RTP Call for Projects process the funding capacity to provide the local match needed to secure these funds to the projects identified to receive them.

Federal Transit Administration discretionary grant award forecasts are also included in the forecast, tailored specifically to projecting TriMet and SMART's historic performance in winning awards in specific FTA grant funding categories, including:

- FTA Capital Improvement Grants (CIG) – up to \$4,683,750,000

Local agencies, including TriMet, SMART and the Port of Portland, worked with Metro to provide forecasts of locally generated revenues and agency costs to maintain and operate their transportation systems. Revenues not needed or used to maintain and operate their systems were forecast as available to fund capital projects. There is variance across the region in local agency revenues available for capital projects, depending on what sources agencies collect and how these revenues are spent on maintaining and operating the local system. Local revenues available for capital projects for the 2023 RTP are summarized in Attachment 1 of the packet and in the presentation.

Local agency revenue available for capital projects is the foundation of the cost targets shown in Attachment 2 of the packet and in the presentation. The presentation provided a draft of the project list cost target information that will be available for the call for projects. Data for some Clackamas and

East Multnomah County local agencies are still being refined. In addition, cost targets for ODOT are pending data from ODOT. Agencies that operate at the regional level (e.g., ODOT, TriMet, Metro and the Port of Portland) will work together with the County Coordinating committees and the City of Portland to leverage funding cost target capacity of multiple agencies when coordinating the nomination of projects.

Tables were shown for draft local agency revenue forecast (for capital projects) for Clackamas County and Cities, Multnomah County and Cities, the City of Portland, and Washington County and Cities. It was noted these numbers are in real dollars, in year of expenditure. They are listed in Attachment of the packet beginning on page 19 and included with the presentation added to the packet following the workshop.

The draft project list cost targets (capital projects) by County/Agency coordinating committee for constrained list cost target, strategic list cost target, and total RTP list target was shown (slide 55 in the packet). Table notes included:

- Operations and maintenance cost data for some agencies in Clackamas County and East Multnomah County is being finalized to determine capital cost targets for those areas. The draft cost targets reflect an extension of 2018 RTP data in the meantime.
- Multnomah County data assumes \$500M of federal discretionary funds dedicated to Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge project.
- Financially constrained transit capital funds available require identification of available financially constrained state and local match funds during the planning process or may be moved to Strategic project list.
- The draft revenue forecast and cost targets for ODOT are awaiting final data from ODOT.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig asked for clarification on the Federal/State discretionary share and how this gets distributed to projects. Mr. Leybold noted the starting point with other MPOs and ODOT for statewide forecast totals and state discretionary revenues for transportation revenues for purposes of long-range planning and forecasting. We looked at all the state and Federal revenues projected and how much comes into the region and of that total for the purposes of RTP coordination and project nomination process.

We split this out by population into four subregions: Clackamas Co., Multnomah Co., Washington Co., and Portland. Asked if ultimately assigned to a project within these regions, how are funds allocated? Up to the coordinating committees? Can these funds be used as the match to TriMet projects?

Mr. Leybold agreed, either those funds or the local funds, and this is the purpose of asking TriMet and ODOT to be working with the coordinating committees so you could leverage each other's funds. Desired capital projects might be of mutual interest where collaboration to constrain the costs on projects. Ms. Ellis added there is no allocation made for specific projects in the RTP.

- Tara O'Brien noted with the Washington County slide \$145 million Federal/State discretionary share in capital revenues and asked if this was restricted in any way. If not just a local match for transit projects, would the County look for other local matches or would other Federal funds be able to be used. What are the potential restrictions for transit specifically?

Mr. Leybold noted this amount of federal funding is expected to be available in the region, in total for all four subregions. Because we are combining these between cost control totals, we are not putting out specific restrictions. We are not assigning specific funding types to projects

that are funded locally or qualify from different projects with restrictions that come from Federal dollars. TriMet and SMART will work with the coordinating committees, the Port of Portland and jurisdictions that bring their own revenue to the conversation. These are placeholders for projected revenues for future projects. It was noted the larger projects in the region (I-5 Bridge, Rose Quarter and Burnside Bridge) for specific federal discretionary funds awarded are restricted to these projects.

- Mark Lear noted the City of Portland have dedicated revenues through 2027 for projects. Are these revenues included in these Federal/State discretionary funds? Mr. Leybold agreed. They make up a small percentage of the amount. In the project nomination process we are asking, if you have revenues dedicated to either Federal or State revenues from pre-2024 revenues dedicated to projects you identify them. The projects prior to 2024 already dedicated to a project or spent on a project will be added to the control number.
- Karen Buehrig asked for confirmation on the control total numbers being controlled by the County, not each city. Ms. Ellis agreed. This allows for some movement between cities because of the way they chose to submit projects. Will ODOT and TriMet be submitted on jurisdictional spreadsheets or own their own? It was noted they will submit their own spreadsheets that match control totals.

It was asked if the 2018 spreadsheets were the base we use or have a base from 2023. Ms. Ellis noted work developed from Washington County recently that integrated the 2023 cost estimates with their spreadsheet. The 2028 spreadsheets can be used, and a template is being developed to help now. Lake McTighe added there are two different spreadsheets: one starting with 2018 projects. The template being developed now will have columns to be populated that don't already have projects listed. Once the projects are added in the Hub and have been updated, it's easy to run a report that produces a spreadsheet that has the new project in them with current information.

- Mike McCarthy asked how these project revenues fit in with developer actions and improvements to conditions on projects, such as improvements along roads in the system, traffic signals or turn lanes. Steve Kelley with Washington County noted we include this as part of the transportation TACS revenue including credits for developer improvements. Each city has a revenue forecast that includes their revenue transportation development projects with credits and developer contributions. The last few years credits have exceeded the developer contributions. Mr. Kelley is happy to go over more details if wanted.
- Tara O'Brien noted a missing "0" from TriMet's strategic cost target column. It was thought heard the total size of the strategic is 1.5 – 2x the size of the constrained. Mr. Leybold noted you have already pre-identified 890 outside the strategic potential, which represents just the capital, not identified what local revenues TriMet would want to bring to projects. Ms. O'Brien confirmed strategic cost targets are not incorporating new strategic growth and operations or other strategic projects beyond constrained.
- Mark Lear asked for clarification on why TriMet's strategic was under \$10 million. Mr. Leybold noted TriMet's strategic cost target number only includes project identified not as capital projects, but they didn't think they could actually get to in this planning period based on project schedule. Everyone else gets their locally generated revenue as well. Continued work with TriMet to identify strategic and local revenues will be developed.

Asked if there were any ODOT forecast updates, Mr. Leybold noted factors they are work on are required separating state from federal revenues and subtracting operations and maintenance costs before capital revenues are forecast. They are close to forecasting revenues

with regarding tolling on the I-5 bridge and I-205 widening projects but need further work on forecasting with the Regional Mobility Pricing Project.

Outcomes-Based Technical Analysis: Project List Assessment (Eliot Rose) An overview of the approach for assessing the draft list of project and program priorities for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan consistent with the RTP policy framework was presented. Updates made to address comments provided by the committee earlier at the past meeting were reviewed. Comments focused on the high-level assessment. Changes have been made in cases where there was consensus among TPAC members and the necessary data and policies are in place to support the recommended change.

Starting with the RTP equitable transportation goal, discussion on changes if made were reviewed:

Draft measure: Is the project located in an Equity Focus Area (EFA)?

Feedback: EFAs are not an adequate framework for assessing equity.

Staff recommendation: No change.

- The adopted RTP directs the region to prioritize investments in Equity Focus Areas.
- Equity Focus Areas are used to evaluate other funding decisions.

Draft measure: Is the project in an investment category that underserved people identified as a priority through RTP community engagement (transit, bike and ped)?

Feedback #1: Projects that do not primarily invest in transit or active transportation can still make improvements to these networks.

Staff recommendation: Change measure as follows:

Is the project in an investment category that underserved people identified as a priority through RTP community engagement *or does the project complete a gap in the multimodal transportation system?*

Feedback #2: Projects that invest in the motor vehicle network can also benefit equity.

Staff recommendation: No change to equity measures; edit mobility measure to credit motor vehicle projects that advance regional goals: Does the project complete a gap in the RTP pedestrian, bicycle, transit *or motor vehicle* networks?

Answering why the continued equity focus on transit and active transportation, Mr. Rose noted:

- Different communities have different modal needs.
- When doing outreach to marginalized communities, we almost always hear a need for transit, often hear a need for active transportation, and rarely hear a need for driving.
- We always hear a need for affordable and accessible travel options. Transit and biking/walking are more affordable and accessible than driving.
- We always hear a need for multimodal access to destinations. We need to complete the transit and bike/ped networks to provide multimodal options.
- Crediting all modes would render this measure meaningless.

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig appreciated the clarity provided on the measures and acknowledgement of additional engagement done in the process. It was asked how credits were earned in equity focus areas and outside these areas for projects that provide equitable transportation. Mr. Rose noted the Equity measure now reads “Is the project in an investment category that underserved people identified as a priority through RTP regional community engagement (transit, bike and pedestrian) or does the project complete a gap in the RTP bicycle, pedestrian or transit network?” The assessment would give credit for each investment category providing equitable transportation, including Active Transportation, Transit (High Capacity, Better Bus, or

Other), or projects that complete a gap in the regional active transportation network as part of a throughway, roadway or bridge project receive credit.

- Jaimie Lorenzini asked for clarification on both equity and mobility measures that address completing a gap in the RTP network. This could mean either infrastructure between two points in the network or expanding the network to places beyond the existing network. Mr. Rose noted gaps are defined for the purpose of the RTP by comparing the planned network to the current network, and gaps are places we note in the planned network we want to have a facility not there yet. The needs assessment maps help provided this information.
- Chris Ford appreciated the approach and staff time to explain this. Concerns were expressed on naming projects investment categories, that while equity measures were important, addition to safety with these investment categories could be considered. They often relate to both goals. For the assessment approach, it seems this asks for getting points if you want the point rather than warrant or justify why you earn the point with the project. For Call for Projects applicants could describe why their project qualifies for the points.

It was asked for more information on what advance feedback on project means. Mr. Rose noted later in the presentation this would be answered, and more on the self-certification process in the RTP. It was noted that where safety is placed was challenging. There is a close relationship between equity and safety. The approach we are inclined to go is keeping measures in the category that most makes sense.

Mr. Rose continued with the presentation with Climate: system-level resilience measures.

Feedback: The proposed system-level evaluation does not capture climate resilience.

Staff recommendation:

- Report on total RTP spending on resilience (and on all other criteria and goals included in the high-level assessment).
- Develop system-level measures for resilience once a regional disaster preparedness plan is in place.

Economy: support for emerging centers

Draft measure: Is the project located in a 2040 center, station community, industrial area, or employment area?

Feedback: the high-level evaluation should capture whether transportation investments support planned growth in developing areas of the region.

Staff recommendation: Change measure as follows:

Is the project located in a 2040 center, station community, industrial area, employment area, or urban growth boundary expansion area?

Economy: access to jobs

Draft measure: Is the project located in an area that offers higher-than-average access to jobs?

Feedback: What about increasing access in areas with lower-than-average access to jobs?

Staff recommendation: No change; show data and collect additional feedback.

Maps were shown where the 2040 growth covers some of the region and where this measure captures projects that help provide access to growth areas.

Reasons we recommended the draft measure is the draft measure is also used in the RFFA evaluation, areas that offer high levels of access typically have land uses that make for successful transportation Projects, adding credit for projects in UGB expansion areas is the best way to credit projects that support increases in access where we need them most, and crediting projects in both high-access and low access areas would render the measure meaningless.

Other edits for clarity / consistency were provided:

- Under Safety, give credit to projects located both along high injury corridors *and at high injury intersections*.
- Under mobility, give credit to projects that include ADA-, pedestrian-, bicycle- or transit-supportive design elements *or system management elements*.
- Clarify that “access to destinations” is the same as “access to jobs.”

Comments from the committee:

- Mark Lear noted the change from “destination” for “jobs”. Concerns were noted in doing this for access to schools and better transit access among other places. What were the reasons for not calling out equity focus destinations? Mr. Rose noted this was a change in wording not the analytical intent. Access to equitable destinations is challenging at region level because they are so much diverse in what the destinations are. Data follows the jobs access analysis in past RTP, with travel patterns showing the distribution mirroring access to jobs. Mr. Lear noted data linked from transit routes to displacement in equity focus areas which will be shared.
- Karen Buehrig noted the Economic Value Atlas, and still not confident with how this tracks job access that have low-wage jobs with accessibility within 30 minutes. It seems to say this investment gets an extra point because this census tract already has low-wage jobs accessibility within 30 minutes. We want these investments to be improving access that improve job access to where there is job activity. It’s not adequately measuring the improvement that projects give related to the economy.

Mr. Rose agreed the purpose should be on the impact of the project on access, but with the constraints of this analysis it’s hard to capture the improvement that fits into the yes/no criteria. A better policy framework at how projects are looked at can be done in the future. Ms. Buehrig noted people are looking to talk about how our investments are supporting our economy and these investments are being made to areas that don’t have a lot of access now but it’s important for improving access to jobs.

- Allison Boyd noted, would it make more sense to use the Job Activity measure (tracts above average) instead of the Job Access measure?
- Jaimie Lorenzini noted the maps seem centralized and leave out urban expansion areas. Some locations in these areas have not progressed in the way intended, so that consideration for projects in these areas might be given an extra point to remove barriers to spur development to get to housing and new jobs needed for access. Mr. Rose noted this is what we are proposing to do.

Ms. Lorenzini noted the need for more emphasis on mitigation of our carbon footprint and adaptation of resiliency measures given our region already experience extreme weather. Mr. Rose noted the call for projects does ask specifically if the project addresses resiliency and we will be crediting projects that make that investment under the resilience measure.

- Chris Ford asked, regarding the economy, how did freight fit in with the project level analysis. Mr. Eliot noted the mobility policy is where we are defining where the gaps are. Ms. Ellis noted freight is a part of the motor vehicle network, with freight network part of the intermodal connectors in this system, a critical part of the freight business that runs through industrial areas and arterials.

From an earlier question, it was asked what are the afterwards to advance projects, and why a project assessment level. Ms. Ellis noted these assessments help us explain how specific projects advance goals in the RTP with priorities of planned investments.

- Jessica Pelz noted the blue/gray map showing access to low-wage jobs. It appeared to show concentration in Portland and then radiating to lower density in the region. It was asked if this showed density of jobs or density of population. For job accessibility in 30 minutes, it doesn't seem to capture what Washington County has in their index. Does it include shuttles or last mile options? Mr. Rose noted what we are doing for this map is taking the center of each census tract and drawing a space where we can reach within 30 minutes of travel time. We count the number of jobs within that space. It measures how many jobs we can travel to in each of these areas in a 30-minute travel time. Shuttle travels may not be included in this but could be added moving forward. Mr. Rose will follow up on more details.

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

Adjournment

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 3:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Miller

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, December 13, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	12/13/2022	12/13/2022 TPAC Workshop Agenda	121322T-01
2	Memo	12/9/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: 2023 RTP Call for Projects Process and Timeline	121322T-02
3	Attachment 1	12/2/2022	DRAFT Policy Framework for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects	121322T-03
4	Attachment 2	12/6/2022	2023 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN Community Engagement Summary	121322T-04
5	Attachment 3	N/A	Examples of RTP Projects and Programs	121322T-05
6	Memo	12/9/2022	TO: TPAC and Interested parties From: Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager and Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager RE: Draft revenue forecast and cost targets assumptions and methods for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects	121322T-06
7	Attachment 1	12/9/2022	Draft Local Agency Revenue Forecasts for 2023 to 2045	121322T-07
8	Attachment 2	12/9/2022	Draft RTP cost targets for capital projects, in millions of YOE dollars	121322T-08
9	Memo	12/8/2022	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Kim Ellis, RTP Project Manager and Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Outcomes-Based Technical Analysis for the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan	121322T-09
10	Presentation	12/13/2022	Overview of Timeline and Process for Call for Projects	121322T-10
11	Presentation	12/13/2022	Draft 2023 RTP Revenue Forecast Assumptions and Project List Cost Targets	121322T-11
12	Presentation	12/13/2022	2023 RTP High-level project assessment: follow-up discussion	121322T-12