



600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736
oregonmetro.gov

JOINT POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (JPACT)

Meeting Minutes

December 14, 2023

Metro Regional Center, Council Chamber

MEMBERS PRESENT

Juan Carlos González
Christine Lewis
Ashton Simpson
Paul Savas
Nafisa Fai
Carley Francis
Anne McEnery-Ogle
Ali Mirzakhali
Steve Callaway

AFFILIATION

Metro Council
Metro Council
Metro Council
Clackamas County
Washington County
Washington State Department of Transportation
City of Vancouver
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Cities of Washington County

MEMBERS EXCUSED

Sam Desue
Mingus Mapps
Jesse Beason
Joe Buck
Rian Windsheimer
Curtis Robinhold
Shawn Donaghy
Travis Stovall

AFFILIATION

TriMet
City of Portland
Multnomah County
Cities of Clackamas County
ODOT
Port of Portland
C-Tran
Cities of Multnomah County

ALTERNATES PRESENT

JC Vannatta
Millicent Williams
Margi Bradway
Brett Sherman
Chris Ford
Emerald Bouge
Scott Patterson

AFFILIATION

TriMet
City of Portland
Multnomah County
City of Clackamas County
ODOT
Port of Portland
C-Tran

OTHERS PRESENT: Ashley Bryers, Christina Deffebach, Cody Field, Jason Nolin, Mike Bezner, Garet Prior, Stephanie Millar, Mayor Lisa Batey, Sara Wright, Jeff Gudman, Mat Dolata, Lakeeyscia Griffin, Dave Roth, Eric Hesse, Gerik Kransky, Scott Langer, Monica Krueger, Karen Buehrig, Brenda Bartlett, Sara Ryan, Sarah Iannarone, RTC Web-Mtgs, Jaimie Lorenzini, COHV, Brendan Finn, Mark Ottenad, Anne McErny-Ogle, Michael Orman, Allison Boyd, B, Glen Bolen, Laurie Lebowsky-Young, Noel Michelberry, Mike McCarthy, Jean Senechal Biggs, Katherine Kelly, Eliot Rose, Aidan Simpson, Jeff Dalin, Chris Smith, Dwight Brashear

STAFF: Connor Ayers, Georgia Langer, Ramona, Malu Wilkinson, Ina Zucker, Jaye Cromwell, Betsy Emery, Lake McTighe, Eduardo Ramos, Victor Sin, Kate Hawkins, Jess Zdeb, Marielle Bossio, Glen Hamburg, Ken Lobeck, Summer Blackhorse, Blake Perez, Jake Lovell, Lisa Hunrichs, Matt Bihn

1. CALL TO ORDER AND DECLARATION OF A QUORUM

JPACT Chair Juan Carlos Gonzalez (he/him) called the meeting to order at 7:30 am.

Chair Gonzalez called the role and declared a quorum.

2. PUBLIC COMMUNICATION ON AGENDA ITEMS

Metro staff Connor Ayers read aloud the instructions for providing public testimony.

No members of the public provided testimony.

Chair Gonzalez moved onto the next agenda item.

3. UPDATES FROM THE CHAIR

Chair Gonzalez introduced Catherine Ciarlo, who shared the fatal traffic accidents that have occurred since the last meeting.

Chair Gonzalez discussed the 2023 UGMFP and RTFP Compliance Report.

Chair Gonzalez shared that compliance with the UGMFG includes meeting requirements for housing, water quality, fish and wildlife, flood hazards for protecting industrial and employment lands, and planning for the UGB. He shared that all jurisdictions are compliant at this time except for a few jurisdictions which are working to complete comprehensive planning areas added to the UGB. Compliance with the UGMFG includes meeting requirements, design, updates to TSP, transportation project development, regional parking management, and amendments to comprehensive plans. All jurisdictions are currently in compliance with that.

4. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Gonzalez noted that there were two items on the consent agenda, Resolution No. 24-5384, For the Purpose of Adding or Amending Seven Projects in the 2024-27 MTIP to Meet Federal Transportation Project Delivery Requirements, and the Consideration of the January 18, 2024 JPACT Minutes.

MOTION: City of Vancouver Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by JC Vannatta of Tri-Met

ACTION: With all in favor, the consent agenda passed.

Seeing no further discussion, Chair Gonzalez moved onto the next agenda item.

5. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

5.1 2027-2030 MTIP Program Direction and Work Program

Chair Gonzalez introduced Metro staff Grace Cho and Ted Leybold to present on the 2027-2030 MTIP Program Direction and Work Presentation

Presentation summary:

Presenters shared the background of the MTIP program direction and work program, discussed the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and Regional Flexible Funds (RFFA) process, as well as the next steps. The presenters discussed the relationship between the 2023 RTP, MTIP, and RFFA. They discussed the funding estimates for 2027-2030, as well as the RTP-MTIP relationship with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The presenters mentioned the roles and responsibilities of the RFFA, its process, the program direction, and its program direction framework. The presenters shared the step 2 project proposals and evaluation and discussed the final adoption of 2028-2030 RFFA. They also shared the carbon reduction program and that the initial input on the RFFA program direction included desires to make a big impact and to support smaller jurisdictions. After sharing the next steps, the presenters asked the JPACT members if they had any questions or initial input on the RFFA program direction.

Commissioner Paul Savas mentioned the measurement of Co2 production asking what techniques they will use as an MPO to measure their gains in Co2 reduction.

Grace Cho responded that they are expected to be coordinated with state efforts. She added that they have done analysis on the reduction of carbon emissions, and that they used similar techniques conducted for the RTP.

Commissioner Savas asked if they are working with other MPOs in the country to look at how they are measuring this, noting that he wants them to be doing the best job that they can.

Cho responded that there are other places in the nation that have been working with this, but there is not always an alignment on that.

Catherine Ciarlo responded that JPACT will be in discussion about the targets and measurements. She noted that they will be looking at other MPOs and find what the best practices are, as well as look towards other ideas JPACT may have.

JC Vanatta asked how much the carbon reduction funding pot has, questioning if it will be around \$20 million like it was for the previous round.

Cho responded that the allocation was about \$18.8 million to allocate for the five fiscal years. She explained that they are looking at the carbon reduction program for 2027-2030, which is four fiscal years rather than five. Cho shared that they are trying to align the years to be as close as possible, and that the carbon reduction fund will be a bit different from flexible funds because it is only a four-year range. Cho stated that they are estimating it to be in the \$12-13 million range.

Ali Mirzakhilili asked what the total fund available is, and when they will know how much is available. He also asked how much money is already being allocated for step 1.

Cho responded that they would reference back to the previous cycle, which shows the program direction for this upcoming cycle. She shared that the last cycle was about \$152 million, and in terms of step 1, including the bond repayments and the operation of several regional programs, it was about \$100 million for the 2025-2027 cycle. She shared that it is about the same this time with about \$50 million each year. She noted that it is a push and pull in terms of getting an accurate estimate and confirming what will happen when they come into the first fiscal year.

Mayor Steve Calloway asked for a definition of a small city.

Cho responded that definitions of small cities are the kind of input they would like to receive, as some of the jurisdictional partners struggle with this. Cho noted that they want the support from JPACT members on that.

Ted Leybold added that they are still taking input on how best to do that.

Mayor Calloway mentioned inflation and how it will look in 2040. He asked if there is money that goes to counties that will help with inflation. He added that there will be shortfalls where that money will not buy as much, asking if there will be a secondary priority for supplying those funds. Mayor Calloway asked where that money will go next if a county must give the funds back because they cannot afford the project anymore.

Cho stated that the RFF are typically awarded to the project itself, but they work as much as possible with the jurisdiction who applied and was delivered the project to find a project that will stay within the intent of the original project and still be within the budget. She added that when a RFF gets awarded, the intergovernmental agreement process will determine the aspects of what will happen if there are budget shortfalls. She noted that if it comes to a point where those funds to go back, they will go back into the pot for the next cycle.

Catherine Ciarlo asked for the staff to define the redistribution funds.

Leybold responded that in the past they have received redistribution funds, and in the past, they have done an allocation of the extra redistribution funds to projects that were trying to get to bid and had a shortfall. He shared that there have been inflationary impacts recently with high inflation rates, and about a year ago they did an allocation of additional funds that came in as more than they were expecting, so they gave this money to reinvest.

Ciarlo noted that the partners work together to try to remove barriers to get things done.

02/15/2024

Minutes

Chair Gonzalez asked if the redistribution funds are incentive dollars for completing the projects on time.

Leybold responded yes, and that the reason they get the funds is that they have an agreement with the State that if they get these projects done on time, they get some of the funds that the State gets from the federal government. He added that this creates an incentive to stay on track so the State of Oregon can become eligible for those redistribution funds.

Margi Bradway encouraged Metro to consider resiliency, noting that the ice storm did harmful things to the budget and that they are not prepared for the financial impacts that climate change is bringing.

Chris Ford asked about the distribution of step 1 and step 2 dollars, asking what discretionary measures they have, if any, and when is how JPACT will be involved if that is the case.

Cho responded that they know that they have schedule of repayments that they need to make from previous decisions. She added that they will start to lay out that information. She noted that they have a sense of the off-breeding costs for the region planning and they will be able to share that information soon. She added that with that information, they will be able to discuss what the next steps are. Cho added that other than the previous commitments of dollars, they have the rest of the dollars to work with.

Leybold added that they can bring the bond repayment schedule and the cost of the region-wide programs, noting that there can be discussion for adoption in the spring. He noted that if there is another related program that people want to add on to, they can do another round of bonding.

Millicent Williams mentioned that the presenters stated that they want the projects to make a big impact, asking what a big impact means to them. Williams noted step 2 of the process, asking if there is consideration for two cities to work closely together to do a shared project.

Cho responded that the second question Williams asked is the type of feedback they are looking for. She noted that they need to face reality that they have a cap for how many dollars they have, and they need to be strategic to get the most out of the funds that they have.

Councilor Christine Lewis remarked that the RTP has challenged them to come up with new programs without the funding to back those new programs. She stated that they should work on the first step.

Chair Gonzalez thanked the presenters for the presentation and noted that they should take climate change seriously. He added that there have been underlying issues to access funds for smaller communities and stated that there are ways they are trying to be creative. Councilor Gonzalez also highlighted that while they talked about the funds in step 2 and the carbon reduction program, there is a third program called the climate pollution reduction grant. He stated that Metro received a grant from the EPA and they are working on a regional climate action plan, and with this plan, they qualify for two implementation grants. Chair Gonzalez shared that while those grants are competitive, it would be amazing to receive those.

Commissioner Savas asked if they could get a better sense in the future about how much money they will have, after the repayment dollars, that will go to the RTP project funds, and how they will distribute those funds.

Chair Gonzalez responded that it will be up to staff to mold that direction, but they have clear direction from the RTP.

5.2 Update on 2023 RTP Implementation and MTIP Amendment and Adoption Process for Toll Projects in the Region

Chair Gonzalez introduced Metro Staff Catherine Ciarlo (she/her), Ted Leybold (he/him), and Kim Ellis.

Presentation Summary:

The presenters discussed the purpose of their presentation, which was to provide an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) directed initiatives and to describe and receive input on the update of procedures to the MTIP amendment process for rolling and pricing projects. They shared a timeline of what has happened previously, what is happening now, and what will happen in the future in terms of the RTP plans. Presenters discussed the procedures for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and the MTIP amendment steps. They addressed the major projects and priority investment outcomes. They shared the next steps for the MTIP process and discussed the 2024-25 JPACT transportation funding work. Finally, presenters asked the JPACT members if they had any questions or feedback about RTP implementation next steps or the MTIP process updates.

Ali Mirzakhali asked when the presenters will be able to share the new metric for measuring a thriving economy, asking if they will be looking at state, local, or national economies.

Kim Ellis responded that this is a new RTP goal which prioritizes access to mixed used centers with economic growth, employee access to jobs, and employer's access to employees. Kim added that they are looking at where projects are serving and who they are serving. She noted that it is focused on the region and how they are focusing on growth and development.

Commissioner Savas shared that he was excited about a thriving economy and noted that they should apply critical thinking on what that informs people on where they could buy a house. He noted that he is interested in measurable outcomes and stated that vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT) would be interesting areas to measure.

Councilor Brett Sherman stated that he is concerned about the underlying costs about the i-205 project. Councilor Sherman raised concerns about how 80% of the money generated by tolling is going to infrastructure and call centers and costs, whereas less than 20% will go to covering the cost of the project. He asked how much flexibility they will have in the future.

Leybold shared that MTIP will bring in amendments as the projects are ready for implementation. He noted that when the projects are underway, they will bring forward the information of the project to JPACT and the Metro Council, who will look at the progress through the lens of the commitments to the agreements with the RTP and MTIP. He clarified that it will be up to JPACT and the Metro Council to ensure that they are making progress and are following the guidelines set by the RTP. Leybold noted that it is hard for him to predict, but when they are getting ready to spend funds on a particular project, they will bring that phase of the project into MTIP and the members will get to see it.

Councilor Brett Sherman noted that although some of the decisions that they make, although small, may impact pricing, and they may find that the costs are incredibly high or higher than expected. He shared that he

wants to know what levers they have access to, and what opportunities they have to move the needle.

Catherine Ciarlo noted that they must start to think about how they want to weigh in on the criteria and the way those criteria are measured.

Margi Bradway asked if the tolling funds will be federalized because it goes through federal approval, or if it will be more localized funds once collected.

Leybold responded that it is not technically federal dollars, so the strings attached with those federal funding programs will not be attached to tolling dollars. He added that they will be spent on facilities that are on the regional system that have been federally funded facilities, so things like the NEPA rules, which are federal rules, will be applied to the tolling project.

Bradway responded that there is agreement from multiple committees that the funds should either be shared with locals or put into local projects, that tolling funds should be used to mitigate and or address the diversion, and that multimodal funding should be available to meet demand. She shared that having those funds be flexible is important to meet those goals.

Chair Gonzalez noted that this project allows for the dollars to support the diversion, transit, and local system improvements. He mentioned that although the funds are not federalized, they are being spent on tolling projects, and he asked where JPACT can influence those conversations and decision points because that flexibility has been shown to be very important to stakeholders.

Bradway noted that IBR has quite a bit of local improvements included in the project, which would be federalized, but a lot of other counties do not have their local improvements included in the project. Bradway asked if they have the flexible funding to do those local projects that are needed but are not within that defined space.

Commissioner Savas responded that as a Clackamas County representative, he comes up with a 10% or 20% increase in Co2 production as a result of the tolling project, and he wants to know how tolling will work best. He noted that every calculation he has conducted has shown an increase in Co2 production as a result of the project as proposed for the 7-mile stretch between the town center and the Abernathy bridge and the 7-mile stretch between the Abernathy bridge and I.5. Commissioner Savas noted that he has concerns about this project in that part of the region.

Ciarlo responded that they should look at the criteria question and link it to the targets as shared by Kim Ellis.

Ellis noted that for the federal target, they have some flexibility, but there's some defined measurement for them to use for that. She added that the target that they are setting is an initial target. She noted that it is a very narrow definition of greenhouse gas emissions that the federal level wants them to be monitoring. She stated that they have more to learn, and they have learned a lot from the RTP process. Ellis noted that the emissions modeled impacts of the larger projects is a different question than the impacts of other projects like building a sidewalk or adding bike lanes. She noted that it is hard to isolate that in their analytical framework.

Commissioner Savas shared that he has a concern that the impacts will be negative.

Councilor Lewis stated that the investments that they make in multimodal, safe crossings, bi-ped, and transit

are all for nothing if the local system isn't allowed to function because of diversion and negative impacts. She shared that they should scope this out. Councilor Lewis also shared that they need more time to get the measuring system right.

Mirzakhilili mentioned the RTP discussion on safety and asked if they are working on developing the forecasting tools. He noted that he finds it to be a weakness that they do not work on it.

Ellis noted that that is an area that is unfunded, and Lake McTighe, who is the leader in this, have helped them do what they can. Ellis added that they know the projects that are needed, and they do not need a model to help that, but getting at some of the deeper questions would require new work that needs funding to do.

Mirzakhilili asked about how they will get to that and reflect their priorities in the funding.

Catherine Ciarlo stated that they know the types of improvements that advance safety, and they can fund those, but the question Mirzakhilili has is about investing, as a region, in the type of modeling that would get to the outcomes. Ciarlo suggested that they are asking a different question when talking about safety versus modeling.

Leybold added that the information they provide for an MTIP amendment is a discussion about what tools they want. Leybold noted that they look at if a project is addressing a safety issue and is the project known to be effective in keeping people safe, which gives it a higher safety score, and distinguishes it as a higher priority.

JC Vannatta noted that there is a constitutional restriction where tolling funds cannot be used for transit capital, and asked if there is a way that some of the funds could be used for transportation projects and other funds used for transit projects.

Commissioner Nafisa Fai mentioned that in June they are going to have a targeted conversation about MTIP projects, and asked about if they will be individually reached out to when the conversation is going to be had.

Ciarlo noted that they cannot give a timeline at this time, but that between now and June, information about funding strategies and funding priorities and needs that the legislative and GAPD team have been working on will be walked through, as well as having a conversation about regional funding priorities. She shared that it will be a regional discussion about what things such as resiliency and safety look like as a priority.

Commissioner Fai asked if this body should focus on the principles and areas that they will focus on, so they can be more centered on those when the MTIP decision comes. Commissioner Fai noted that the 2022 documents have not been updated, asked how they can hold the system accountable, and noted that they should see how JPACT can play an active role.

Ciarlo noted that the documents in the packet reflect the written direction pulled from the ordinance that referenced those documents, so there was no attempt on staff's part to update or change the 2022 documents. Ciarlo added that they will have a conversation about whether that information is adequate.

Leybold added that they will receive information on these agreements and that they can have another discussion about if they will be updating those documents.

Commissioner Fai asked if there is a way to include what the leader is for each project.

Ellis noted that those are in the attachment, or in chapter 8 of the RTP, and that they are working to produce the unified planning program.

Seeing no further discussion, Chair Gonzalez moved onto the next agenda item.

6. **UPDATES FROM JPACT MEMBERS**

Due to time restraints, there were no updates provided from the JPACT members.

7. **ADJORN**

Chair Gonzalez adjourned the meeting at 9:33 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Georgia Langer".

Georgia Langer,
Recording Secretary

ATTACHMENTS TO THE PUBLIC RECORD FOR THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 15, 2024

ITEM	DOCUMENT TYPE	DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT NO.
3.0	Presentation	02/15/2024	Fatal Crash Slide	021524-01
5.1	Presentation	02/15/2024	2027-2030 MTIP Program Direction and Work Program Presentation	021524-02
5.2	Presentation	02/15/2024	Update on 2023 RTP Implementation and MTIP Process Presentation	021524-03
5.2	Presentation	02/15/2024	RTP Implementation Work Presentation	021524-04