

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday, March 1, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Tara O'Brien
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Community member at large
The Street Trust
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Washington Department of Ecology

Alternates Attending

Jamie Stasny
Sarah Paulus
Francesca Jones
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Dakota Meyer
Gregg Snyder
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Troutdale and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Chris Ford
Lewis Lem
Marianne Brisson
Sara Westersund
Jasia Mosley
Indi Namkoong
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy

Affiliate

Oregon Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
Oregon Walks
Community member at large
Verde
Clark County
C-Tran System

Danielle Casey

Federal Transit Administration

Guests Attending

Chris Smith
Cody Field
Cody Meyer
Erin Engman
Jan Tysoe
Jean Senechal Biggs
Jessica Engelmann
Joseph Auth
Mara Krinke
Mat Dolata
Matthew Hall
Nadine
Natalie Liljenwall
Phil Kase
Stephanie Millar
Steve Koper
Tara Weidner

Affiliate

Citizen Activist
City of Tualatin
DLCD
City of Tualatin
City of King City
City of Beaverton
City of Beaverton
City of Hillsboro
Parametrix
City of Hillsboro
WSP

Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Tualatin
Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, Jeffrey Hood, Jess Zbed, John Mermin, Kate Gregory, Kate Hawkins, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickelberry, Shannon Stock, Ted Leybold, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster.

Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Neelam Dorman announced ODOT Region 1 is looking for a Strategic Initiatives Advisor who will report directly to Chris Ford, our Policy & Development Manager. An ideal candidate would have experience and interest in both public policy and project management. The recruitment closes on March 13.
https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/en-US/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Strategic-Initiatives-Advisor_REQ-149769

It was announced our 2024 pre-application cycle starts up for the Transportation Growth Management program. The formal period for pre-application ends April 1. The pre-application is a short paragraph describing the local issue and desired outcome after which one of our planners in Region 1 will reach out and help you develop the full application, which that period begins in May and closes in July.
<https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/TGM/Pages/Planning-Grants.aspx>

It was announced there is a rebate opportunity for EV charging station purchase and installation. This is through ODOT’s Community Charging Rebates program. It opens March 5 and runs through July 3, or until the funding is exhausted. This is the second round of this funding. We have about 2 ½ million dollars available for projects. The program will reimburse some of the project costs of buying installing level 2 EV charging station

at multifamily homes, workplaces and publicly accessible parking areas. The rebates can range from \$4,500 to \$5,500 per charging port or up to 75% of eligible costs. The entities that are eligible to apply are businesses, nonprofits, public entities, tribes and owners of multifamily complexes.

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/climate/Pages/communitychargingrebates.aspx>

Eric Hesse announced PBOT is hiring two different contractor positions. These were shared in the chat: PBOT Contract Analyst II: <https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/portlandor/jobs/4402754/contract-analyst-ii-cppw>

PBOT Contract Analyst I: <https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/portlandor/jobs/4403969/contract-analyst-i-cppw>

Monthly MTIP Amendments Update (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted end of January through mid-February 2024. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.

Fatal crashes update (Lake McTighe) The monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was given. It was noted this was preliminary data shared by ODOT and news reports. It was reminded we read the names of people killed on our roadways in recognition of our ongoing work to make travel safe. At least 13 people were killed in February. A link to Metro's most recent crash report was shared in chat:

<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/2023/12/14/Safe-Street-for-All-report-November-2023.pdf> We are currently working on developing more analysis as we begin to implement the Safe Streets 4 All grant. Chair Kloster noted Metro is in the process of interviewing for an Associate Planner as part of the Safe Streets 4 All grant.

FY 2023-24 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Administrative Amendment for EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (John Mermin) It was noted in the packet there's an administrative amendment to the current year Unified Planning Work Program. That's where we summarize all the regionally significant planning work done going on. This is for the Environmental Protection Agency's Climate Pollution Reduction grant that Mr. Rose has come to talk about on the agenda. This is just bringing that formality into our UPWP for the current fiscal year. For any questions contact Mr. Mermin.

2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Implementation Activities (Kim Ellis) It was called to attention handouts included in the packet that were provided to JPACT at their meeting last month. Highlighting some of chapter 8 RTP related activities which many were reflected in the UPWP this year. Staff are working to incorporate all the changes to the 2023 RTP that were adopted by JPACT and Metro Council last November to have a final published document. By the end of this month, early April, we'll complete our final travel analysis with the travel model and documenting other things. We will announce when this is available for distribution.

Update on Hybrid Meetings (Chair Kloster) It was noted we hope to have a couple hybrid meetings this year scheduled for TPAC. In other words, we'll have a physical meeting at the Metro Regional Center that will also be available online. Technology is being updated in the Metro Council Chamber for public meetings. Notice for the hybrid meetings will be given well in advance for the committee and public.

Climate Reduction Grant (Eliot Rose) Good news was shared regarding the Climate Pollution Reduction grant. We submitted the first deliverable, the priority climate action plan, to EPA just this morning. It was sent out to the Climate Partners Forum, which is our technical advisory group for the project. Appreciation was given to everyone for their contributions. This was a different process that was halfway between plan and pre-application for a federal grant, and required an incredibly quick turnaround from efforts across the region. There are several implementation grant applications that we're tracking moving forward that's in the plan. The website page for the project that has the final plan posted was shared in chat: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/tools-partners/grants-and-resources/climate-pollution-reduction-planning-grants>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from February 2, 2024

Minutes from TPAC February 2, 2024 were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment Resolution 24-5395

Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Ken Lobeck) Information was presented on the March 2024 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment that adds one new ODOT project. The project is a project grouping bucket (PGB) containing approved Carbon funding to be committed to later approved signal system upgrade projects. The project will provide improvements to signalize intersections throughout ODOT Region 1 area located in Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties to allow for coordinated signal timing upgrades.

Comments from the committee:

Jaimie Lorenzini asked if we know which intersections will be affected. Mr. Lobeck noted at this point he believed ODOT has not specifically identified location with the committed funding in Region 1. Neelam Dorman noted ODOT does have the intersections identified. They are in corridor locations mentioned; TV Highway, SW 72nd, OR 217 interchange, Beaverton Tualatin Highway, OR 141 out west, 99W out towards Sherwood, OR 212, 217 between I-205 and Rock Creek Junction.

The way it's prioritized is by way of three steps the program funds are divided. One goes to the MPO with the carbon funds that they have. There's an application process for small rural areas. It was believed one of those rounds has gone through with a second round coming up or open now. The third division is really the statewide project bucket. Each region essentially applies for it. This is for our signal operations on ODOT facilities in Region 1. The signal managers have put together a list on the corridors that identified greatest need areas for carbon reduction benefit. The corridor coordination helps move people faster with less delay and emissions. Other efforts outside of this grant program are being identified for transit signal priorities and individual intersection timings. This is very much a carbon aimed project selection.

Ms. Lorenzini asked if it would be possible to provide a more descriptive project title. Ms. Dorman noted I think there's the bucket part of where it's trying to describe the allocation of the bucket vs the actual corridors that get the allocation. When this was first drafted the locations weren't identified. It could be noted for simply ODOT Region 1 because that covers the whole region. The intersections are identified but more identified and listed from the corridors. It was suggested a map provided to help understand the transportation system flow with this program.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 24-5395 to add ODOT's new Carbon funded Signal System upgrade PGB to the 2024-27 MTIP.

Moved: Jaimie Lorenzini

Seconded: Neelam Dorman

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Westside Multimodal Improvements Study (Kate Hawkins, Metro/ Stephanie Millar, ODOT) Kate Hawkins presented information on the background with the study. Since the pandemic, we've seen fewer people on transit and changing travel needs. To sustain the area's economic health and quality of life, the Westside Multimodal Improvement Study will think big about how people and goods travel in and through the Westside Corridor today and over the next 20 years.

The study looks ahead to find policies and investments to create solutions that address five priority areas: Mobility, Safety, Social Equity, Climate Action and Economic Vitality. Issues and needs were identified with the study:

- Transit travel times are not competitive
- Inadequate "last mile" access
- Congestion due to limited capacity
- Traffic safety for all users and modes
- Impaired freight movement

Modeled scenarios were presented using the 2045: The Regional Transportation Plan as a baseline. Each of the scenarios were described with a scorecard on the priority areas. Chair Kloster asked what RTP was this built on; the 2018 or the 2023 RTP draft. Noting this was the 2023 draft, it was asked if this was the public comment draft that went out last summer. This was confirmed.

Comments from the committee:

Karen Buehrig noticed the changes in travel time with the scenarios, but it didn't seem there was much change in mode shifting to other modes across all the different options. I don't know if that's just a factor of the way that the model works, but how do we better capture, talk about, or even make happen more ability for savings and time travel with people actually shifting their mode and not necessarily just use the same mode elsewhere?

Stephanie Millar noted one thing to highlight was used, in this case the travel time and mobility and reliability which were key issues that were of importance in the Governor's request to us. If you look at the corner on this slide (RTP baseline) in the 2045 RTP, the expectations from today to 2045 are an increase of 1% in HOV and 6% in transit, bike and pedestrian use, and a decrease in 3.2% of single occupancy vehicle use. So that's our baseline that we're working from. Then as you go to the subsequent slides you can see how the investments that we're making further those baseline assumptions about where we're getting from today with the investments that are planned in the next 20 years and what would happen if we made these additional investments. We saw some good progress in the 2045 RTP. These are incremental changes of those kinds of improvements. Interesting thanks are in scenario 3 where we are losing ground on single occupancy vehicle reductions and scenario 4 how each of the different levers moves these items. The results for this were confirmed as being for the study area.

Sarah Iannarone had a question about tolling. The Street Trust has a pretty nuanced position on this via our work with congestion pricing over time and also our work on the regional tolling advisory committee. From what we've learned in our engagement is that the public has a really hard time

understanding the differences between traditional toll programs where we price a right of way to make improvements in that right of way. For instance, on the Interstate Bridge Replacement project vs things that are more dynamic and variable, like congestion pricing to manage demand on a system. It's a little bit confusing for me in the way this was presented what type of pricing we are talking about here.

And then, how the proceeds might go toward alleviating congestion in those corridors, especially since we haven't really been able to hammer out what revenue sharing for things like transit operations, people walking and biking, and other investments would be in some of these congested corridors. Can you talk about how you approach this so we can understand the complexity of this conversation and then understand the priorities that if we did price the system, especially in ways that helped us meet our climate and equity goals, how they'd like to see those proceeds invested. Long story short, how did you talk about that pricing the system?

Stephanie Millar noted the nuanced recommendations of the Steering Committee are coming in the presentation. What the Steering Committee said was pretty much what you are saying. We see that tolling has the kinds of benefits and movements that we're looking for, but we don't feel it can be done in a vacuum. So what the committee's recommendation was we move forward with studying some key physical improvements along with tolling so that it was paired with a funding strategy. Ms. Hawkins added it was stressed that this was just the initial really high level first look at tolling on Highway 26 and 217, one of 80 plus potential improvements that we evaluated. There was clear understanding among our committee and all the technical staff that we work with that, and we really need to know a lot more and do a lot more study to dive into the types of questions that you're talking about. A lot more to uncover. That would be future work that would proceed this.

Ms. Millar noted the Steering Committee's recommendations and outcomes from the study:

- Consensus to advance multimodal investments such as transportation demand management and transit supportive programs and projects
- Consensus to study *Strategic Capital Investments and Funding Strategy* by looking at tolling paired with complementary corridor investments
- No consensus on Northern Connector and North Willamette Bridge

Comments from the committee:

Tara O'Brien asked to dig into these recommendations a little bit because I know there's a lot of different options you're hoping to continue to study. What are the advanced multimodal investments and transit supportive programs and projects translate to or look like? Is it to begin project development on some specific capital projects? Is it to refine the list of what to prioritize and who is on point for those? Can you talk through what the next steps looks like on selecting these multimodal investments in transit programs and projects?

Ms. Millar noted as we were working through this process a lot of things happened simultaneously such as TriMet Forward Together and some changes in Metro's and ODOT's transportation options programs that became elevated as solutions that could be applied here. Basically, spotlighting things that we were already moving towards or were already happening and making sure that they were applied appropriately in this corridor to help support those things. For example, Metro just gave some additional funds to the Westside Transportation Alliance, and partners at the Washington County Chamber are interested in working directly with them to help employers utilize those services better. Those are kinds of relationships that were built out of the work that's been

done here. That's something that is doable in the more near term. Ms. Hawkins added this is the reason there will be a list of specific programs and lead agencies that come out of this. We don't have that today because we're still in the process of obtaining final steering committee approval and sign off on what that recommendation looks like. Ms. O'Brien added it seems like the roles and responsibilities and who's on point to advance some of these recommendations is key next steps. Glad to hear it's coming.

Eric Hesse noted as someone who served on the project management group I wanted to acknowledge their work and consultation team for how they managed a very complex process to a really wide range of potential solutions in this important corridor. I also appreciate how the process ensured alignment with the region's congestion management process to prioritize demand management and improve non-driving options prior to considering or advancing capacity expansion. I also appreciate the creativity and collaboration of the other team members which shared thoughtful engagement in both the analytic details while also remaining attendant to the ultimate outcomes of the project.

Portland specifically shares the region's interest in ensuring people and goods movement in and through this corridor to support a thriving economy in the region. At the same time, Portland is concerned about the prospect of pushing significant levels of additional automobile traffic onto local streets and appreciates how that issue is considered during the project as concepts were narrowed to advance in next phases. We are also encouraged by the results of scenario five showing the potential of pricing bundled with other investments to manage demand in the corridor. We see real opportunity to use the next study of pricing called for by the steering committee to both better understand the potential of pricing but understand how it could interface with the other tolling and pricing projects advancing in the region.

Dyami Valentine echoed sentiments shared by Mr. Hesse with appreciation of the efforts by the project team and facing the challenges this project tackled to advance important work as was mentioned out of the Washington County Future Study. This is a critical corridor for our community members on the west side. Where this project landed is a good outcome in terms of helping advance important considerations and look forward to continued partnership and coordination with the future study.

Mike McCarthy added appreciation to the team on their efforts with this project. Also reiterating the importance of Highway 26 for the communities and businesses through all the jobs, the economy, the whole region. I think I heard some disappointment that the transit and even the managed lane option really didn't move the needle in terms of viability of the corridor mode splits. And then I think hearing some concern about the effects of tolling and some of the issues about diversion and safety impacts particularly on arterials and through some of our town centers and other areas. But overall, just a lot of support for this project and a lot of support for maintaining the viability of the Highway 26 corridor which is critical.

Allison Boyd noted as another member of the project work group I echo a lot of the comments. I thought it was difficult to take a lot of different options, a lot of different complex modeling data, and try to pull that together into some scenarios, into some packages to do some deep dives in discussing and understanding how those items move this area forward. I appreciated how we were able to find a path forward that focused on the multimodal investments and demand management and looking at that before we're trying to do any major expansions to capacity. We look forward to

participating in the next phase and making sure that we structure that process to be able to answer questions raised by Ms. Iannarone.

Stephanie Millar noted the next steps in the project. Recommendations presented will be circulated for Steering Committee review and confirmation. They will be seeking endorsement of the final report by participating local agencies, non-jurisdictional partners that participated, JPACT, and Metro Council. We hope to see in the 2025 transportation package further work in this corridor funded to follow up on the recommendations made with all the great data and analysis that was collected through this process.

Gregg Snyder noted what a great team to step into the space here, which was requested by the business community. I reflect back on all these efforts started when the region almost lost a major economic development opportunity that was only rescued by the Governor and the Governor's direct intervention with this study. I think the outcomes are really important. We know that tolling is going to be a part of this solution of the package. It was one of the main things that moved the needle. The question for the study is how that fits in with the region. A major outcome of this is the focus on TDM and travel demand management options, things like van pools or shuttles or incentive programs. I think that having a comprehensive base of TDM measures, not just reinforce what we say in policy and the RTP but can actually bring those sorts of travel options to the industrial workforce.

Ms. Millar and Ms. Hawkins thanked the committee for their comments. The link to the study was shared in chat: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/news/study-evaluates-strategies-improving-travel-westside-greater-portland>

2024-25 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (John Mermin, Metro) Information on the 2024-25 UPWP was presented, noting this is an annual federally required document that ensures efficient use of federal planning funds. Metro is asking the committee to look for opportunities for projects to be better coordinated, look for ways to add clarity to project narratives, identify any missing information in the project, and identify missing project narratives. TPAC will take action on the UPWP for recommendation to JPACT at the April 5 meeting.

Comments from the committee:

Mike McCarthy noted one of the areas that I think we should really be looking into is basically some of the why for certain things happening. For example, the fatal crash report heard each month and how much that just keeps getting longer, and more people are dying on our system. Despite all the hard work trying to reduce that it's not only not moving, it's going backwards. It's almost double what it was 10 years ago and I'd like to see us look into why. The same thing with our mode shift and failing to shift more people out of single occupant vehicles, instead of choosing transit, walk or bike. I'd like to see what can be done about this and hopefully make progress towards our goals. I'm hoping we can include some kind of study or evaluation to look at the why on these issues and what we can do about it.

Chair Kloster noted there are projects that are in this UPWP that apply to this. They are all funded projects that are moving forward, getting at some of those questions. One issue I think you are calling out is to make sure folks are saying that in their narratives. Another could be talked about in their project scope. Mr. Mermin added there is a specific project focus with Safe Streets for All over the next two years. Mr. McCarthy noted there's particular ideologies that are driving some things, so

that if we do “X” it will make things safer. I think examining some of those assumptions is very appropriate considering what we’ve been seeing in the last decade.

Eric Hesse noted building on this around how do we ensure that we’re moving toward our goals, I’m not entirely sure if the UPWP as a product is the right place other than the projects. How we think ahead and move toward this next RTP and all our local work is important. Portland’s Vision Zero team has also analyzed why and has shared some information with us recently around some of the trends and some of the causes. Maybe that’s part and parcel with those solutions and how we’re responding particularly in design elements because sometimes that may be contributing. What they also found out is that speed, distraction and inebriation are leading causes of some of these trends. So some of that is not engineering. That’s why we need a safe system approach. We need to continue to focus on where our actual infrastructure is in need of improvement. There are plenty of opportunities but it’s sort of a cultural norm. When our vehicles are getting larger, the fatality of crashes rate is increasing, there’s a whole lot of layers to this that aren’t simply our engineering choices. This is part of what should be included in the conversation. What are we learning? How do we share that? And then what do we do about it?

Chair Kloster proposed having a presentation on Portland’s projects profiles, at least some of the work being done with the Safe Streets, Safe System Approach, done before and after metrics to be able to show what was changed, but also the behavior that changed or did not change or degree of change. All those kinds of things that we have to track to figure out are we actually having that impact. Going forward it’s important to call this out in the scoping that we’re doing for these projects. It’s also important for us to learn from the work that’s rolling out on our system. Ms. McTighe has that planned to share at upcoming TPAC workshops and broader workshops aimed at professionals with best practices. They’ll be innovations that we haven’t figured out yet to be part of the design side. The issue of enforcement is part of the discussion. Mr. Hesse added appreciation for the work on the document that has become a more accessible document.

Dyami Valentine noted in terms of appreciating the product itself, there was a question on one of the work items. I appreciate seeing the update to the transportation functional plan and that schedule outlined. I was impressed in terms of the aggressive timeline of that. I wanted to confirm this because a lot of us will be tracking that closely as many of us are updating our transportation system plans with the goal of being consistent with that and doing some of our scoping. There seems to be a lot of work coming out of the RTP especially in the performance measures and the mobility standards. I’d like to confirm that timeline and if we’re anticipating having that wrapped up the middle of next year.

Kim Ellis noted we think that’s our goal. But we will be doing more detailed scoping and working with TPAC on that work plan and timeline. This is sort of an initial thought around trying to get it done because in recognition that many TSPs are going to be starting, have started, or will be starting. There is a sense of urgency, but we’ll take the time that we need to do it. I think the main goal is that we finish it before the next RTP update begins. We’ll begin scoping that in 2026. It’s not a hard deadline but that was a general time of year because it does seem there are specific things that we need to be working on. In addition to bring in some of the new work from the RTP, but it also hasn’t been updated since 2012. There’s a lot of outdated references. We will come to TPAC for discussion to develop the more detailed work plan around that timeline for working through it.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Program Direction Discussion (Ted Leybold & Grace Cho, Metro) The presentation began with a brief background overview of what the Regional Flexible Funds Allocations (RFFA) program entails, the process program direction, Feb - June 2024, Step 2 project selection, Sept 2024 - Spring 2025, and adopt final RFFA, Spring - Summer 2025. The existing RFFA program direction was reviewed including the components and policy directives.

The RFFA Program Direction – Strategic Regional Funding Approach (interim) was explained including allocation objectives and cycle structure. Step 1 funding:

- Project Bond Funding - \$52 million
- Region-wide Programs & Planning - \$41 million
- Current Forecast: *estimated* \$153 million

Step 2 program direction:

- Capital Grants – estimated \$60 million
 Previous cycle – just under \$47.5 million
- Single allocation category
- Desired outcomes:
 - 1) advance implementation of RTP goal areas
 - 2) meet strategic regional funding approach, allocation objectives

A summary of initial input on RFFA program direction to date was given. Next steps were given.

Comments from the committee:

Neelam Dorman noted it was understood and appreciated that there's a lot of policies and guidance that we're trying to reflect in the program direction and use as a basis. One of them mentioned was the regional transportation funding approach put together in 2009 for JPACT and updated. I couldn't find it in past RFFA materials and would appreciate having that shared with the committee to see what it is and how it's evolved since it's a pretty big guidance for the RFFA cycle.

Another request is when you draft the program direction if you could memorialize when and how JPACT and Metro Council decided on the bond repayment and the MPO dues. It would be good to have that documented somewhere showing how this was done such as a special resolution or during a RFFA cycle and continually supported in the following cycle. To clarify, my understanding is that JPACT and Metro Council can direct the program however they want. For example, if they wanted to prioritize some of the 2023 RTP goals and tackle in this RFFA cycle they can, or if they want to change the steps or add sub buckets or may want more than two steps. Are there any other restrictions on JPACT and Metro Council outside of the step two? You mentioned the no sub allocations and that they have to meet Federal funding requirements, eligibility requirements.

Ms. Cho noted the two specifically mentioned were just a couple of examples. I would look specifically back at the 2025-27 RFFA cycle program direction because one of those allocation objectives are included as part of that project direction. That's a starting point guide with reasons why several of those allocation objectives are in there because they're derived from making sure that we're meeting the federal regulations. In answer to your questions regarding JPACT and Metro Council essentially having a free reign, this is where we are having a discussion. We are operating under the assumption that we're starting from a lot of the same elements or components from the 2025-27 cycle. I think if there is a desire to discuss something that departs significantly from those, this would be the time that we are asking members to provide that input and feedback. We are specifically calling out what we're operating under, here are the main minor refinements that we imagine occurring under these four elements today.

Mr. Leybold added I think what we're saying is if people are contemplating significant departures from what Ms. Cho described this is the time to let people know, so that we can bring back and frame those conversations properly through JPACT and Metro Council process.

Allison Boyd noted some of her questions were asked by Ms. Dorman such as the strategic regional funding approach. I was trying to follow along and it looked like it was mentioned there was an increase to \$60 million for Step 2. Is that because there was that bond repayment reduction in Step 1 and that's being allocated to Step 2 now? Ms. Cho noted that's where we're placing it at this point. Federal repayment did get reduced or does drop in those federal years 28 through 30 from their high points that were in 25 through 27. The Step 1 was essentially showing the minimums that you would put amongst those two main components in Step 1, our project bond payment as well as working under the operating assumption that we continue the regionwide programs and planning activities. Everything else is dropped into Step 2.

It was confirmed this was all part of the program direction that will continue to be discussed in April and May. It was noted in the packet we had specific criteria for Step 2 as an attachment. Clarification was asked that was not going to be attached to the program direction. Detailed decision on how criteria would be measured by the June adoption would not be included in the program direction, correct?

Ms. Cho note this was put in as reference because that was the information in the application packet from the last cycle. In a sense that's where we're starting from. As you note, those evaluation measures are attached to the 2018 RTP but may need some refinements. They are intended for task information to be able to have some informed discussions. Metro staff will be finalizing the criteria for the Step 2 process this summer. As part of the program direction adoption, we're looking at the smaller two tables identified in the TPAC memo. Essentially, it's the four outcome areas and then discussion on what are those outcomes that we're trying to measure that's associated with each of those major goal areas that would be appropriate for the scale and size of what we're talking about in terms of the regional flexible fund allocation. Because we have performance measures for other parts of our planning work but they're looking at the systematic level vs individual projects for evaluation and consideration.

Confirmations on the program direction document were acknowledged. Regarding the carbon reduction funds, it was asked if it's known what they're proposing for the method for allocation or project selection for that? Or will this be decided by that June time period? Ms. Cho noted it's unlikely that will be decided by the adoption of the program direction. It is something we're trying to keep in mind. As we mentioned last month, we are going to allocate for the next cycle even though we noted the number of risks as it relates to that. We want to coordinate as much as possible. We'd like to look at streamlined opportunities with programs with carbon reduction but at this point we haven't made any decisions. We are still looking at the timeline for that. Unlikely for June but will return to TPAC when we have something more substantial to discuss.

Ms. Boyd added Multnomah County also supports further exploring resilience being added in since that was part of the 2023 goal areas and something we may be able to leverage other discretionary funds.

Eric Hesse noted to respond to the questions posted from the presentation, Portland is supportive of some of the test cases in terms of particularly the thriving economy goal added to the RTP. Since our

understanding is also that the MTIP is expected by our federal partners to align with and advance those long-range goals. I think continuing to look across those areas and ensure that we're aligning makes sense. Working from objectives that are defined in Chapter 2 under each of the goal areas is a promising way to think about framing it seemingly like we've done in the other goal areas. It seems like a reasonable approach even as you need to adjust some of those to evaluate projects rather than systemwide. Also appreciating that the goal area did evolve around climate to include a greater focus on resilience.

To date, I think we've heard articulation of trying to help us grapple with some of the impacts that have occurred. We are struggling a bit to understand how these types of projects, which tend to be at least in Step 2, much more capital projects that might align with what might in fact be operating cost impacts, but how do we think about that? I would like to get a little more tangible about what some of those project priorities might be that would address that, or hopefully we might be able to both make our system more resilient while also addressing the other goal areas.

Specific to some of the issues raised I would say from Portland's perspective, appreciating that you needed to put some numbers in certain pots today, but I think we would still want to have open for conversation as to whether those additional 13 point something monies coming from the bond area were to be allocated into Step 2. Ted Leybold noted this was not. It was noted that's an important conversation for policy makers to have particularly as we look at some of the input around how we continue to advance the CIG (capital investment grant program from the Federal Transit Administration which supports major capital projects and transit) pipeline and make those larger transit investments leverage significant Federal funding opportunities.

<https://www.transit.dot.gov/CIG>

On the CRP (Carbon Reduction Program) it might behoove us to be thinking a bit this spring around how that might compliment this program as we move forward to the program direction which may be of interest from policy makers understanding the full package as we discuss whether and how to focus on any particular areas.

Ted Leybold noted we've heard comments like wanting clarification on the forecast money and what monies were forecasted to be available vs what were the existing commitments. The funding of the Step 1 programs that we've always done at the existing capacity levels. Which we've defined as adding 3% per year to those programs to maintain their existing proposal. Given that we laid that out there is obviously money remaining or now from the reduction in the bond payment proposal if there's no other proposal on spending that it would go into the Step 2 program.

Tara O'Brien noted this is one of the main sources TriMet looks to for match for capital investment grant projects in addition to the many uses of RFFA funds. I saw in the feedback Metro is continuing to do some planning for tier 2 and 3 corridors in the HCT (High-Capacity Transit) plan but as is known, there's a very giant unfunded gap in our tier 1 HCT projects right now as well. Though we hear the interest in continuing of forward planning for more of those corridors, there's still a lot of work to be done on the tier 1 corridors in order to build those out and provide match for those. I hope we can continue to look to this funding source to help match the projects we currently are working on, planning and trying to deliver because it has been a critical funding source for that. I wanted to clarify that piece since we know that many of the HCT tier 1 projects still have a lot of funding to get through.

With regards to the resiliency and climate piece, definitely hear the need to continue to figure out ways to invest in this infrastructure. I also know the Step 2 funds are so critical for local jurisdictions to look to for many of their projects. So if there are ways to weave in that criteria in terms of how we're retrofitting our infrastructure to support multiple goals, like making multimodal investments as well as thinking about making systems more resilient, definitely look forward to having that conversation as we're trying to find all the places for how to support our partners in their resiliency plans. It does seem like there are several sources of federal funding currently available to support resiliency improvements to infrastructure. Mr. Hesse added to Tara's point, programs like PROTECT and the Bridge program are examples.

Dyami Valentine noted after each of these rounds there's been a desire to debrief from the previous round. I think there was a solicitation for comments and input. I wanted to know if this feedback has been received from previous rounds incorporated into the direction we're moving right now. Washington County is supportive of the thriving economy and having resiliency consideration as well into the desired outcomes and looking at appropriate criteria, acknowledging that we have in prior rounds also had a fairly strong thriving economy component. There were numerous rounds where we had the freight greening economy and desired outcomes as well as active transportation elements of the Step 2 program. We probably have some existing criteria that could be looked at from those previous rounds that may be relevant for that thriving economy desired outcome.

In terms of how substantial we want to shift gears this round or not, similar to what Ms. O'Brien was talking about in terms of building on our existing commitments, I also think we need to build on previously funded development projects and make sure they advance. We have a number of those that have been funded in previous months. I hope we can structure this in a way that continues those projects.

Acknowledging this is a substantial amount of funds but have typically funded relatively smaller level projects. When spread thin the impact of achieving some of the outcomes get a bit diluted. Thinking strategically about how we invest these dollars is important. I could see some desire coming forward to think about maybe prioritizing some of those outcomes. Maybe it's around safety or climate change that could potentially direct us in investing a little bit more substantially or maybe not as in smaller less impactful projects.

Ms. Cho noted we have been looking back at notes and lessons learned. A lot of the same questions came up each cycle along with some tradeoffs proposed. We're looking back and thinking through and trying to think creatively how we could propose elements of the process that might be different more specifically. We're thinking about that in Step 2. Still open to feedback and comments. Mr. Valentine added I might just encourage us to have that reflected from previous rounds shared out as well.

Mike McCarthy noted in terms of the thriving economy goal I want to suggest some sort of criteria about access to jobs and helping people get to employment and resiliency. I think some key barriers are places where we would lose connectivity in the event of a big earthquake for instance. You mentioned process considerations. I wanted to bring up a case from the last round that left some bitterness around our part of the region. And that was one project that was going to make some big improvements to sidewalks and bike lanes along an arterial. And how the existing road happens to have a narrow strip of concrete right behind the curb so some call it a curb, but a lot of people are just too afraid to use it with no bike lane or separation from the travel lane. Because of that it lost a

lot of points in both the pedestrian criteria and also the equity criteria because people said there's already a sidewalk. I hope that in this next round we don't have the same kind of situation if a similar project gets considered.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted comments oriented around the idea of the kind of language that we're using. I'm curious going forward how the term resilience will be defined. Because there's a lot of different ways that we could use that lens. Whether that means at more the adaptation of the climate change spectrum vs the mitigation side, or it could be resilience action needed. Having additional clarity around how the word resilience is being used would be helpful in providing better feedback.

Going back to the 25-27 RFFA direction, which includes some nuances around the technical evaluation side. One thing we did was include both qualitative and quantitative information in the technical report. And that qualitative element help reflect attributes about each project that were easy to capture in the strict numerical score. That in mind, can you remind me of the process? Last cycle when we were doing technical evaluations, when the initial review was done, did local jurisdictions or applicants have the ability to submit project revisions to help increase their technical score in response to concerns?

Ted Leybold noted there were two parts to this. The first was to do a risk assessment for project delivery risk. And we had a consultant go in and review the applications for that purpose, and they had the opportunity to interview the applicants and provide feedback. Then the applicants had the chance to revise and provide additional information around the risk assessment and the ability to provide information that could make their risk score lower. With regards to the technical scoring or rating process on being responsive to the outcomes and goals around the technical rating. I think unless there was a specific clarification question raised by the work group that was doing that work there wasn't feedback on your initial rating and not an opportunity to revise the application. There was only if the work group asked for additional clarification around something they weren't sure about those were the opportunities.

Ms. Lorenzini agreed with the understanding why that approach would be appropriate because it gets a little dicey when we talk about revisions to scores when it should be an unbiased score. That in mind, as we start thinking about how we can better support smaller jurisdictions and the idea of language that can be more abstract than perhaps the question calls for vs giving concrete examples of what is planned. That in mind, when we start doing the technical evaluation I wonder if we can build in a free technical evaluation where we could get some coaching and input to revise before we do the technical evaluation to flesh this out more. This could help not just those small jurisdictions but create a better understanding of how these projects are driving toward these big impacts that Metro is wanting to see to better meet goals. Regarding comments on lesser quality or underdeveloped sidewalk infrastructure, I wonder if there might be a nexus to bring in some of the ODOT information around levels of traffic stress and how that maybe can apply to places where there is substandard infrastructure that maybe deterring multimodal shift.

Dyami Valentine noted following up on this, it reminded him about some of those lessons or feedback from previous rounds. The pendulum has swung over time in terms of local evaluation because at one-point counties were doing that evaluation on behalf of Metro. From the last cycle I think there was some criticism, or at least self-perceived criticism from Washington County and other applicants in the county was the lack of opportunity to provide some clarity around some of the evaluation. I don't know if there is a way to incorporate a concurrence that seems reasonable in

the evaluation approach or how that could be included in the process. That's from numerous rounds where more localized evaluations were included.

Mr. Leybold noted we've always allowed county coordinating committees prioritization process as one of the inputs to the decision before it's made. And part of that is the county coordinating committees working together to look at their projects collectively and look at the technical ratings that have been provided, look at the risk assessment that's been provided, look at the public input that's been provided in your part of the region, and then consider amongst yourselves what do we think are our priorities as a sub region. And that input has often had an impact on the final decision made as one of the inputs to JPACT and Metro Council. That really has been part of the process every cycle. We're not proposing anything different this cycle at this point unless we hear something, some input that we need to change for that. That's something laid out as part of that process. So you have that opportunity at the sub regional county coordinating level to then think about all the inputs yourselves and try to provide a sort of sub regional priorities.

New Federal Greenhouse Gas Performance Measure Requirements (Kim Ellis & Eliot Rose, Metro)

The presentation began with noting FHWA requires RTPs and MTIPs to report on short-term performance measures and targets. FHWA added a new requirement to report on GHG emissions; Metro and RTC need to set individual targets and a joint target by August 8. Information on FHWA performance measures and targets was provided. The RTP reports on long-term performance measures established by Metro Council and JPACT. The RTP and MTIP report on short-term monitoring measures required by FHWA. Appendix L of the RTP describes these FHWA measures and targets. FHWA is now adding a measure for climate. These targets can help us understand whether the region is on track to meet its longer-term goals.

Details on state and MPO requirements was reviewed. The GHG calculation methodology for states and target setting timeline was reviewed. It was pointed out:

Metro and RTC must:

- Set initial GHG targets by August 8, 2024.
- Establish a joint target that is consistent for both MPOs.

Metro and RTC may:

- Adopt ODOT's target, WSDOT's target, or a custom target.
- Establish individual targets for their respective MPO regions that differ from the joint target.

Oregon and Washington long-term climate goals and approaches to setting FHWA targets was described. Next steps for this cycle were listed with presentations at TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council, with additional coordination with RTAC, RTC, ODOT and WSDOT. August 8 is the deadline for Metro and RTC to submit targets to state DOTs. Metro staff will be returning to TPAC in April to discuss potential target-setting approaches.

Key takeaways from the presentation:

We need to determine an FHWA GHG target soon – by August 8.

The new FHWA GHG target will be one among many performance targets and data points on climate that the region tracks.

The FHWA GHG target is very different from the State climate target used in the RTP. Aligning the two will take significant work and iteration.

The easiest path to compliance is to adopt the OR or WA state target, both jointly for the RTC-Metro regions and individually for our region.

We have an opportunity to learn and iterate. There are no penalties for missing targets, and we will next update targets in three years.

FHWA is requiring MPOs to report this measure. TPAC can influence how we report it and how we apply the results in decision-making.

Comments from the committee:

Dyami Valentine noted in terms of additional information that might be helpful, maybe not everybody is familiar with the National Highway System Network, so making sure we know what that system is in further information provided. It was noted there is a map of this in the RTP. In addition, bonus slides not shown at the meeting will be included with the presentation when the packet is updated online. Maps are included.

Mike McCarthy noted in terms of the information that could help us, you can walk us through the Oregon and the Washington targets and what they are, how they get used, how you see them working well. Then just the feedback I would offer is I'd want to stay as close as possible to what our real goal is. And I think our real goal is reducing greenhouse gas emissions. So I want to stay as close as possible to actually modeling that. Because I think when we go to proxies or approximations or VMT per capita within the region we start getting away from our real goals and we can get to some measures that might reduce VMT per capita within the region, but might increase trips to and from the region, which will actually increase the overall greenhouse gas emissions. Same kind of thing where vehicles emit different levels of pollution, whether they're driving at a continuous speed or stop and go traffic. I think that is something that really should be considered when we're looking at this because I'd want to make sure we're getting as close as possible to our real goal of greenhouse gas emissions reduction.

Karen Buehrig noted in addition to the added presentation slides are there any other background reports that we should be familiarizing ourselves with or any sort of written documentation because it's difficult to be able to provide feedback to something that you're seeing right away and just to be better prepared as we go into the next meetings. Chair Kloster we can provide links to things that are happening at the state and federal level. This is new information coming out fast and posted on various websites but may not be helpful with our state target setting.

Mr. Rose added we can certainly follow up and send out good summaries so the committee can review a little more in advance next time. Ms. Buehrig noted the links to what the state was doing, since there seems to be this parallel, they're making some decisions and then we make some decisions, so that would be helpful. Kim Ellis added we do have the targets that both ODOT and WSDOT set and submitted to Federal Highway, so we can submit those summary documents. They are 2 pages and do not have a lot of information but at least it's their formal submittal. We'll get together some additional materials to help everybody get up to speed.

Eric Hesse gave appreciation for the impressive summary of both how these fits within the broader climate context in both states, and what we need to do in the context of this new rule. I echo what others have said and agree it would be helpful to see the summaries alluded to. In terms of one of the questions posted to the committee with the different approaches noted between the states, I think understanding a little bit more perhaps directly from those involved from the state in a future meeting, around how they thought about that and what the strategy was might be helpful. Including why Washington can get different outcomes in the same time period and what they are doing differently, appreciating there are a number of key policies the state has adopted. I think that will

help us understand how we should situate the regional target relative to that. Appreciating the short timeline, it doesn't feel like the opportunity to have the region understand how it can be measures as noted, the progress toward its own goals as it fits within the state. Clearly both states have a lot of regulatory and other context around that. I think continuing to understand how we might think through a target keeps us on track. All the policies, projects, development patterns and regulatory requirements may not align perfectly but understanding how they connect is an opportunity.

Additional thoughts on the subject were noted to send to Ms. Ellis and Mr. Rose by next Friday. Tara Weidner added the WSDOT folio on their target information with a link in chat:

<https://wsdot.wa.gov/sites/default/files/2024-01/TPM%20New%20GHG%20measure%20folio%20Jan2024.pdf>

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, March 1, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	3/1/2024	3/1/2024 TPAC Agenda	030124T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	2/23/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 2/23/2024	030124T-02
3	Memo	2/20/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments: End of January through mid-February 2024	030124T-03
4	Memo	2/23/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Administrative amendment to the 2023-24 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)	030124T-04
5	Handout	2/8/2024	Summary of Near-term Regional Planning and Collaboration to Implement the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan and Address Key Transportation Issues of Regional Concern	030124T-05
6	Draft Minutes	2/2/2024	Draft minutes from TPAC February 2, 2024 meeting	030124T-06
7	Draft Resolution 24-5395	N/A	Draft Resolution 24-5395 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING A NEW ODOT CARBON FUNDED SIGNAL SYSTEM PROJECT GROUPING TO THE 2024-27 MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	030124T-07
8	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5395	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5395	030124T-08
9	Staff Report Memo to Resolution 24-5395	2/21/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: March FFY 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-5395 Approval Request	030124T-09
10	Fact Sheet	N/A	Westside Multimodal Improvements Study Addressing Transportation Challenges on the Westside	030124T-10
11	Fact Sheet	N/A	Westside Multimodal Improvements Study Who experiences transportation challenges in the Westside Corridor?	030124T-11
12	Document	February 2024	Draft Discussion: 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program	030124T-12

13	Memo	2/23/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner, Metro RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Program Direction Overview & Input Received to Date	030124T-13
14	Attachment 1	2/23/2024	2028-2030 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation – Summary of Input Received from TPAC	030124T-14
15	Attachment 2	N/A	2025-2027 RFFA Technical Evaluation Performance Measures	030124T-15
16	Handout	2/22/2014	Coordinated Timeline for Meeting New Federal Greenhouse Gas Performance Measure and Target Setting Requirements	030124T-16
17	Slide	3/1/2024	February traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	030124T-17
18	Presentation	3/1/2024	March 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-5395	030124T-18
19	Presentation	3/1/2024	Westside Multimodal Improvements Study	030124T-19
20	Presentation	3/1/2024	2024-25 Unified Planning Work Program	030124T-20
21	Presentation	3/1/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Program Direction Overview & Input Received	030124T-21
22	Presentation	3/1/2024	Introduction to FHWA GHG performance measure and target	030124T-22
23	Slide	3/1/2024	Websites with Additional Information	030124T-23
24	Handout	2/16/2024	Oregon State Initial GHG Report	030124T-24
25	Handout	2/16/2024	Washington State Initial GHG Report	030124T-25
26	Handout	January 2024	TPM Greenhouse Gas emissions rule changes	030124T-26