

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday, April 5, 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
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Tara O'Brien
Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Marianne Brisson
Sarah Iannarone
Sara Westersund
Jasia Mosley
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly
Steve Gallup
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Port of Portland
Community member at large
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
The Street Trust
Oregon Walks
Community member at large
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Clark County
Washington Department of Ecology

Alternates Attending

Sarah Paulus
Francesca Jones
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Gregg Snyder
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

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 Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Jaimie Lorenzini
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Shawn M. Donaghy
Danielle Casey

Affiliate

City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration

Guests Attending

Anthony DeSimone
Ari Del Rosario
Bryan Graveline
Cody Field
Jason Lugo
Jean Senechal Biggs
Jeff Owen
Mat Dolata
Max Nonnamaker
Russ Doubleday

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Portland Bureau of Transportation
City of Tualatin
Washington State Department of Transportation
City of Beaverton
HDR
City of Hillsboro
Multnomah County Health Department
Kittelson & Associates

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Eliot Rose, Jake Lovell, John Mermin, Jonathan Williams, Kate Gregory, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krueger, Shannon Stock, Summer Blackhorse, 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

Updates from committee members:

Karen Buehrig announced Clackamas County has reopened the recruitment for Principal Transportation Planner. Contact Ms. Buehrig directly for more information. A link was shared in chat: It is listed under Principal Transportation Planner.

https://hrapp.clackamas.us/psc/recruit/EMPLOYEE/HRMS/c/HRS_HRAM_FL.HRS_CG_SEARCH_FL.GBL?Page=HRS_APP_SCHJOB_FL&Action=U

Neelam Dorman announced the Oregon Department of Transportation Statewide Safety Office is conducting some public engagement to inform the annual highway safety plan that they put together as part of it. There is a traffic safety survey out and open to the public. It's a short 3–5-minute survey getting input statewide. A link was shared in chat: More information available here:

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Safety/Pages/Transportation-Safety-Public-Participation-and-Engagement.aspx> with the link to the 3-5 minute traffic safety survey.

Chair Kloster announced Metro has hired an Associate Planner through our Safe Streets for All program. Anthony Cabadas, who currently works for the City of Portland will be starting at Metro April 15.

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

Fatal crashes update (Lake McTighe) Chair Kloster noted TPAC had suggested including updates that talk about things we're doing in the region to address what has been really concerning. This new format starts today and will be suggested for JPACT as well. Encouragement was given for feedback.

The monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was given.

As noted, something new is being tried this month. While it's important to honor those people who have died on our roadways and in these preventable and tragic crashes, we also want to remember that we are continually committing to systemic change on our roadway system to prevent future traffic deaths. This is a commitment to safe streets, and we're redesigning our most dangerous streets represented by the high injury corridors to move toward safer speeds, slowing down travel speeds and using a variety of tools to do so. Safe people, that's all of us creating a culture of shared responsibility through education, direct engagement and safety campaigns. As well as focusing on safe vehicles, technology and post-crash care.

Some of the actions regional partners are taking for safer streets:

- **Rest on Red, City of Portland:** pilot technology to help stop excessive speeding during late night and early morning hours when large roads are wide open.
<https://www.portland.gov/transportation/vision-zero/rest-red>
- **2024 Oregon Active Transportation Summit, The Street Trust and partners:** grounding advocates, organizers, professionals, and decision-makers in the shared belief that a better future is possible.
<https://www.thestreettrust.org/programs/events/oregon-active-transportation-summit/>
- **Clackamas County Traffic Safety Videos:** community members meeting monthly to promote traffic safety county wide and safety. <https://www.clackamas.us/meetings/engineering/tsc> and <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PW-xBsTB3nM&t=2>

Please reach out with any comments on the monthly fatality report and safety update and/or with any information that you would like to highlight at an upcoming safety update:
lake.mctighe@oregonmetro.gov

Climate Pollution Reduction Program grants update (Eliot Rose) It was announced Metro received a planning grant from EPA to create two climate action plans for not just the region but for the entire metro statistical area. This includes Clark County, Skamania County, Yamhill and Columbia Counties as well as the three Metro area counties. We completed the first planning deliverable and submitted that at the end of February a little bit before the March 1 due date. Actions that we've included in that plan were eligible to apply for implementation grants from a separate funding stream that EPA had also set up for this program. I believe we had five applications go in from our region that collectively are asking for close to a hundred million dollars in grants.

Highlighted were two from TriMet, one for electric buses and one for transit prioritization which is a joint application from TriMet and Metro. One from Washington County, one from Clackamas County. The City of Vancouver and their Vancouver Housing Authority teamed up to retrofit affordable housing units that were owned and operated by those agencies to provide energy and efficiency retrofits to people living in affordable housing. Metro applied for a small five million grant to do the same kind of energy efficiency work on new affordable housing constructed through the TOD program to provide incentives for that to be more energy efficient. The City of Gresham submitted an application to recapture waste methane generated from its wastewater treatment plant.

This is a diverse group of projects that plays across a lot of sections. The state of Oregon and Washington both submitted sizeable packages. Oregon went in between a hundred and two hundred million. The state of Washington went for the biggest grant category, up to \$500 million. Their grants contain a lot of new state programs that invest resources down to the local and regional level in climate work. EPA will announce these in July unless it gets pushed back due to the number of applications to review. The committee was encouraged to contact Mr. Rose for further information:
eliot.rose@oregonmetro.gov

Karen Buehrig noted there are a lot of different moving pieces around actions that we can be doing to address climate change. It was asked what the next steps were regarding the climate pollution reduction planning grant work. It was thought there may be other steps in the process. It was suggested a work group be planned where different items would be presented for deeper conversation and education on the different actions planned. It was noted a climate change implementation funded project moving to a new project about Climate Smart Implementation Program Reserve was on this agenda next. Trying to follow these is hard to keep track of.

Mr. Rose noted there is another round of planning we have to do. After picking our most implementation ready, high impact greenhouse gas reduction projects, which is the scope of the previous plan, we will go back and cast a wider net to do a full comprehensive climate action plan for the Metro statistical area. That process started in March. We plan to continue convening that Climate Partners forum that helped steer the previous deliverable in some form. We're working beyond that, still trying to figure out the implementation plan. A lot of that depends on being on the same page with resources because we want to make sure that we use this planning process to position ourselves for whatever implementation funding may be available. I think we need to do more research for what direction we're heading with the next plan. A review of the federal and state climate related funding sources is a big part of that plan that wasn't as much of a requirement during the first round.

Chair Kloster added we plan to have Mr. Rose return to TPAC to talk about that work plan for this phase two. Phase one didn't follow our traditional processes. This next round would be more typical of planning and making sure people can track progress with proper engagement. Informational discussions can be planned with the committee to weigh in on the work program. There's a lot to learn about the EPA program that is worth the time to learn about. It was asked what the timeline was for phase two. Mr. Rose noted we're hoping to start in summer 2024 in initial conversation in June, July. And then pending EPA's approval of the extension that I just requested will have until the end of 2025 to submit it. I hope to get the extension because they already granted it to Oregon State, and it would be really useful for us to be on the same timeline as the state so that we can continue to coordinate across the state and regional plans.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions updates (Kim Ellis) It was announced there has been two recent court decisions regarding the federal greenhouse gas rule that basically are saying Federal Highways didn't have the authority to set the rule and the target setting in place invalidated them. The rulings came out of Texas and Kentucky. There are another 20 states that have lawsuits on this. So we are temporarily postponing our presentations until we have more clear direction around next steps for this. Presented last month both WSDOT and ODOT have submitted their targets to Federal Highway under what was required in the rule. We had 180 days each at Metro and SWRTC to develop our individual target for each of our MPO boundaries as well as a joint target for our region. Federal Highways has not officially made any statements or announcements about next steps for this rule. We've heard from ODOT staff they're encouraging MPOs in Oregon to continue to go through the target setting process. We will keep you apprised going forward. Ashley Bryers agreed we are all in a holding pattern and will hopefully learn something new soon.

Chair Kloster asked that postponing today doesn't change our ability to meet the August deadline, should we try to still go there. Is there still a JPACT check-in in May? Ms. Ellis noted we were scheduled to go to JPACT in May and Metro Council next week. The Council presentation has been cancelled. We could come back to TPAC at the May meeting and pick the conversation back up and bring forward more specific items for TPAC to provide feedback on to be able to make a recommendation to JPACT

at their July meeting. Links from the court filings were shared:

Texas ruling (read here) <https://subscriber.politicopro.com/eenews/f/eenews/?id=0000018e-855e-dc9c-ab9f-adfe6b270000>

Kentucky ruling (read here) <https://subscriber.politicopro.com/f/?id=0000018e-9f08-dbca-afce-df7d0b480000>

Judith Perez Keniston added we're just waiting for more guidance as well. We appreciate the team work on this to try to figure out how to make this timeline. It may not be the original timeline but it doesn't change our commitment to climate policy in our region. We welcomed federal policy to help us forward. But we already had a climate policy in our region and in our state. Chair Kloster added we'll monitor Metro committee work programs and send out an update if something happens.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from March 1, 2024

Minutes from TPAC March 1, 2024 were approved unanimously with one abstention: Will Farley.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment Resolution 24-5409 Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Ken Lobeck)

The April 2024 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment bundle adds five new project projects. Two are new ODOT project grouping buckets (PGBs) focusing on highway safety upgrades. The remaining three new projects belong to TriMet. One project is a new Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) federal funded award supporting the purchase of a replacement battery electric bus. The final two new projects are FFY 2024 Congressionally approved Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS) awards. One is a \$1 million award providing supplemental funding to support the Gateway Transit Center upgrades as part of the Better Red MAX Line Extension project. The other is a \$5 million federal award that will support the design and construction of the new Columbia Operations facility. Details on the projects were presented.

Comments from the committee:

Tara O'Brien added a quick clarifying comment and thanked Mr. Lobeck for helping get this in quickly. We had been waiting for months for final appropriations bill to get this money moving. On the Gateway Transit Center, it's not technically part of the Better Bus Project. This earmark is beginning the expansion to other elements of that transit center to prepare for service expansion unrelated to the MAX changes that just happen at Gateway North. We have a lot of transit center improvements underway. This is one of them, much like our Oregon City transit center project, where we're doing a rehab and design to provide the space for service expansion needs for buses.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 24-5409 to add the five new projects to the 2024-27 MTIP.

Moved: Tara O'Brien

Seconded: Dyami Valentine

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

2024-25 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Resolution 24-5399 Recommendation to JPACT

(action item) (John Mermin) The presentation included a brief overview of the annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) of what is included or not in the document. Staff is asking TPAC for recommendation to JPACT to adopt Resolution 24-5399 that includes 2024-25 UPWP (Exhibit A), and Self-certification findings that demonstrate that Metro meets federal planning regulations (Exhibit B).

Comments from the committee:

Neelam Dorman acknowledged the effort on this and the very thoughtful and thorough responses to the many comments provided in the UPWP during the review process.

Karen Buehrig added appreciation for the work put into this effort. One small request was made to have page numbers added to the bottom of pages. There's an index that gives page number for projects. But when the document was printed it didn't print the page numbers. That would be useful to have added. There is a lot of good information, and it was appreciated where cross-outs were made so additional language was seen. Details related to project costs which is informational were mostly found at the end. Mr. Mermin noted the clickable table contents will connect you to the project narrative until the actual page numbers are added for the printable and final version.

Eric Hesse added appreciation as well. An additional request for information related particularly to the Climate Smart implementation piece. I think just knowing that there was some of the USDOT climate pollution reduction funds allocated to Metro for use on that could be written up somewhere in there. Some of the tools and other development coming out of the RTP could be part of how we think about the work plan and understand how we're moving forward with our climate analysis and action in the region. I see other linkages to elements of the research with development of the next level model or activity next generation model.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 24-5399 adopting a UPWP for the Fiscal Year 2024-25 and certifying that the Portland metropolitan area is in compliance with federal transportation planning requirements.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Neelam Dorman

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Meeting break for 5-minutes

2028-2030 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Discussion on Initial Options (Ted Leybold)

The presentation began with a background review of what the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) represented and where in the 2028-30 RFFA process we are currently. The RFFA program overview was provided showing components, policy directives and structure, and available funding. Committed:

- Bond repayment - \$52 million
 - Regionwide programs & planning - \$41 million
- Discretionary – estimated \$60 million
- Defaults to Step 2 capital grants if no new Step 1 initiatives

Program direction options were reviewed.

- New Bond allocation
- Step 2 Evaluation Criteria

- Project Design as stand-alone evaluation element
- Step 2 RFFA Cycle Objectives

Each was described in detail with possible scenarios, principles, evaluation criteria including new objectives for climate action and resilience and thriving economy. Step 2 Project Design Evaluation and Cycle Objectives were given. Timeline of the RFFA program direction development was provided.

Comments from the committee:

Karen Buehrig asked to speak first to the options around how Step 1 and the bond repayment and the different options there. There's a lot of things to be considered as we move forward to thinking about whether or not there should be kind of a next bond. Is this a good time with regards to cost of money? A few items that I think will be important is how that money will be spent. I know there's direction here such as objectives about how the money will be spent if we go forward. I think people will want to know what the money will be spent on.

In the packet it said the projects will be included as part of the engagement process for 2025. I think this was the regular engagement process with the whole package. How do we get there? Another comment is sometimes Step 2 ends up being a remainder of what's not spent in Step 1, and perhaps we should have a direction that says the amount in Step 2 should increase at the same rate or more as the other programs are increasing. As in Step 1 we're saying that they're generally increasing at about 3%. We should also make sure that our Step 2 amount is increasing at least that 3%. I think about it in that way because we don't want less being spent on Step 2 because we've made these greater commitments in Step 1.

Eric Hesse asked for clarification on the intent of the program direction that would move beyond the principles around how the bond would be spent through the public comment process. I think it was suggested naming one or more projects that might be funded or it's maybe up to us in the direction, or maybe the Metro staff proposal envisioning that process and would refine in time for the public comment period. What's the range of that intent? Mr. Leybold noted what we're trying to describe is that a proposal will be developed that will say here's the bond amount that we're going for the projects that would be spent on, and a more refined estimated bond payment schedule for adoption. And then that proposal would then be put forward for the public comment process.

Mr. Hesse appreciated the summary since it was a struggle with the numbers, which was appreciated you put in the memo. I think the summary was helpful in the sense showing how those numbers dipped. I will note that maybe having some different calculations there might help see how different scenarios would potentially vary. But maybe the summary is sufficient now in terms of the risk knowing we need to dial in the assumptions much more closely. Regarding the concern around current cost of money and rates, can you clarify when this bond would likely be paid given the timing of this being 2028-30 money. Does the bond action occur in 2028 or sometime between them?

Mr. Leybold noted when we were looking at our estimated costs, we were assuming that would be driven by the needs of the project selected for funding in terms of when they actually need those revenues to be provided to the project. That's when you would time the sale of the bonds against it and then the rates would be locked in at that point. We had our finance team look at it in terms of today's rate with a little bit of a fudge factor just to give us a rough estimate. At this point the timing of that will really be driven by the projects selected and the needs of those projects for funding.

Mr. Hesse noted just to be sure I'm tracking I believe that means too it could well proceed the 2028 to 2030 that would be using some of these current funds in the way that you have laid out in the MTIP that is almost constantly getting reprogrammed and rebalanced. I think that it also wouldn't mean alteration to any of the current commitments there. It would really be more how we're managing those funds and then we'd be able to recognize and pull back and forward from the 2028 some of these funds. This makes for better understanding on implications.

Tara O'Brien asked for clarification that you were looking for feedback on these principals today so that we can move forward with beginning to talk about what those projects would be, so that we're beginning to have a broader overall picture. I know there's a longer list on page two, page 60 of the packet, of some things of what would inform the decisions around projects to go into a bond. It sounded like Metro was generally pointing towards the staff recommendation being that middle of the road option of a 50-55 million amount rather than the no bond or the larger potentially riskier option. I think that sounds reasonable. I'm interested in others' perspectives on that.

From TriMet's perspective this is one area that we have a long history of being successful and using these funds to significantly leverage larger capital grants. It's one of few sources we consistently have looked to for help kick off project development for these big capital investment projects. So we're certainly hopeful to continue doing that in these Step 1A funds. One note to add is not seeing constructability making sure we're putting these project funds towards things we're ready to build, that can make a big impact because it would be expensive to borrow these funds. I think that's generally accounted for in there but wanted to be sure we're reflecting that.

Dyami Valentine shared similar thoughts in terms of project readiness. What are those eligible projects and timing wise in terms of what projects might come forward and if this is the right time to advance an additional bond liability on our RFFA funds. What potential projects might be out there and where are we as a region in terms of delivering a project. Maybe we need to continue thinking and understanding not just the process but from a timing standpoint, can we do that in a timely manner to inform the public conversation. Clarification was asked on table two in the memo and the forecast numbers. The flat revenue forecast versus reduced revenue forecast, the numbers and the impacts on Step 2 seemed reversed in some of the later years. I was surprised that under the reduced revenue forecast Step 2 implications would be, in the out years, have a higher impact. I'm assuming that's available funds that are remaining for Step 2, correct? Mr. Leybold agreed. It was noted the flat revenue has lower revenue in the out years.

Ted Leybold noted that was just a scenario of the flat continued all the way from today's levels out to 2039. This was showing one scenario for the federal approach we're able to basically limp along at the existing levels. There's no real consensus to change but there's no either way as opposed to the reduced revenue scenario where today's federal authorization levels have a higher level of contributions from non-transportation revenue sources such as the general fund, that there might be a movement to sort of reduce in the short term, that general fund contribution. If we did that a likely outcome would be you'd still use some level of historic growth from that new starting point that's lower to grow at traditional levels. Traditionally we've been growing at about 2-3% per year at the federal level, mostly due to increase in transportation related fees and revenues. It would start to grow again from that lower level. That's why those outer years would then be catch up and maybe even past that flat line scenario.

Eric Hesse noted from Portland's perspective it was appreciated having this proposal on the table recognizing how these funds have been used over time and how it responds to the past pretty consistently with direction from JPACT and Metro Council around this opportunity of leveraging federal funds. I appreciate the conversation around risk and timing considerations recognizing the funding is available. We just completed the HCT strategy update over the last number of years. And in the RTP we have some key priorities and there are significant levels of funding, for example the climate investment grant program that we can be leveraging at record levels. These can be significant funds in addition to the sort of big match on construction funds which may be at historic highs to add to local and regional matches. There's also the ability to start matching earlier for project development and moving projects forward. But you need to demonstrate the financial capacity to get into those federal programs to be able to get those matching funds going. This is a really important strategic opportunity. I think the principles lay out a pretty good balancing act of recognizing the risk factors and the opportunities and is well framed for JPACT's consideration s well as information to help us think though that.

Karen Buehrig noted it would be helpful as we get to that JPACT decision to be clear on which elements of this specifically around the bond decision they will be making in June vs things that will happen across time similar to Step 2 projects. I think it would be difficult for us by June to understand which pathway, which amount to go with in respect to the bond because that will be influenced by the projects that are appropriate to be paid for by the bond. As we think about how we're shaping the question to JPACT in June and questions to be answered during the Step 2 process it may be similar to how projects are selected for Step 2. It might be a pathway to decision making over the next year.

Neelam Dorman noted something that would be helpful would be to see how the previous bond effort penciled out. What was done, what was the rate of borrowing, what was the final cost of everything. More importantly what we got from it. I saw the list of projects but it's a little hard to digest that as we invested through this bond measure a million dollars, and with that million dollars we were able to leverage \$20 million from other things. Just seeing that as a clean comparison of how this last bond process worked would help me better understand what our potential gains could be on the risks that we're taking, borrowing at a higher rate, and also just borrowing in general.

Mike McCarthy wanted to reiterate a question heard earlier regarding which projects and what's the specific need for the money now. I think it will help the JPACT discussion. The other question I have is considering past projects that often seem to take a lot longer than initially expected so the money ends up getting spent sometimes several years after it was anticipated to be spent. How does that factor into the assumptions and kind of projects here? I can think of a couple projects that we got funding for in 2012 that are just starting construction now and was anticipated to be spent in 2015 where it's actually going to be spent several years later. As we're looking at the projects coming up are we anticipating some sort of a lag in when they actually get done and when the money actually gets spent? Or are we expecting them all to go on schedule?

Mr. Leybold noted the timing of the bonding is really tied to the project schedule itself. You don't sell the bonds and commit the money and receive that money. The bond proceeds when you're into the project development schedule. The exact costs are driven by that project schedule. And when you lock those rates in. I was just doing some scenarios just to show you the relative risks. But I would say those projects tend to be closer to on schedule than many of the delays we've seen at community level projects that have often run into unanticipated troubles with the federal aid

process. The timing of the bond sales with project delay doesn't mean we sit on the money. The bonds are sold when permitting and projects are ready to go.

Tara O'Brien wanted to follow up on Ms. Dorman's question because yes, the last page of the packet has some details about generally the projects that have been funded but not how this contributed to the overall amount and of the CIG projects and how we use this as match. Noting Metro will be providing details on all the Metro programs and the outcomes from them at the workshop next week, it would be helpful for us to prepare any additions to share or work with Metro teams on more details on what we've been able to accomplish with that in the future. It would help tell the story of how this money has been essential to building out our transit system. Mr. Leybold agreed that would be helpful and we can work with you on this. It might not be possible to have everything prepared by next week, but we can provide something preliminary or of that nature soon.

Eric Hesse noted overall from Portland's perspective the proposed additional thriving economy, climate and resiliency measures seem a good solid starting point. Knowing some of those get a little more dialed in and refined about how they get measured in the thresholds. I think those are appropriate, consistent, and relevant and I express support for that at the proposed option element. Regarding the program direction or program goals, one note I'd make is a typo on the slide, just so there's no confusion. I think that the two amounts or the two bullets referring to the amounts duplicated the project development. I will note I wasn't fully recalling that those thresholds were in place and looking at past awards it doesn't seem that was always enforced. It was asked if there are any other comments around how firmly Metro intends to hold those in because there were at least a number of awards sub \$3 million last round. Just recognizing inflationary pressures and maybe reasonable, but just to understand that proposal and think maybe have some questions around whether that million-dollar threshold for project development is appropriate or not that may be a little high there.

On the construction piece where if you receive funds for construction previously, you would not be eligible this time. I would note the intent around ensuring that new projects are coming into the fold. However, at least in this cycle, we might need to consider the inflationary impacts and what that's meant for being able to deliver the projects that we've previously funded and allocated toward. And whether there could be some important consideration by JPACT and Metro Council on at least for this cycle we might need to recognize there could be a need for some additional funding if new cost estimates have been refined since the last time. It was suggested having opportunity for others to identify as we're developing our projects, recognizing we need to do it this spring, that there may be important gaps there to close, so we are following up on previous commitments successfully, could be an important consideration before we endorse that concept.

Will Farley noted the evaluation criteria were good and were well set up. There are concerns about the cycle objective's part. The two that we had in there were to foster greater impact towards the five goals by encouraging larger project proposals. But in that same idea we wanted new opportunities to compete and giving smaller jurisdictions assistance. They seem to be counter to each other the way they are set up. Increasing the minimums goes against some of the smaller jurisdictions being able to compete because not all the smaller jurisdictions can easily go in for a million-dollar minimum on project development or \$4 million capital projects. I feel like encouraging the larger project or if the goal is to really have greater impacts towards the five goals, not larger projects, a larger project proposal is not the only way you can take big bites of the apple, or you can

take a lot of small bites of the apple and still have a great impact. I feel the minimum changes don't make sense if we want to encourage other, smaller jurisdictions to have a chance at this money.

Karen Buehrig had a question related to table three, the technical evaluation criteria. For the most part the changes look good. On the first one for equitable transportation, it says meets a transportation need identified by the community. I'm looking for more input on how that would be shown and are identified knowing that all these projects are projects that are in the RTP and on transportation system plans. How would that be evaluated? Has thought been put into this or would that be something that would be talked about further during the criteria process?

Mr. Leybold noted we can provide more detail. My recollection is what we're looking for there is that there was some identification during your local planning process that the equity communities themselves identified the project as a priority for them. That could be through a planning process or through other means as opposed to simply saying that was identified at the agency level. It's just identifying that there were support from that affected communities that this is important to them. I think that's the concept.

Ms. Buehrig wanted to make a couple of comments regarding the Step 2 cycle objectives. I agree with Mr. Farley about the minimum amounts and going up, and perhaps what we need is information about the experiences that have been had for those groups for the projects in the last cycle, or maybe we have to look back at different levels for required match. Perhaps examples behind more information about why those were increased. Right now, it just looks like it was increased. It's not clear why a smaller project is creating more challenges at these amounts.

Concern was noted about the subregional application limits being reduced by two by each sub region. Have we been having a problem with too many applications? I think in the last cycle it was complicated by the fact that we also had the parks bond applications that we were trying to balance as we were doing the RFFA process. So that was more applications. It wasn't in the packet how many each sub region already has but I will call out four in Clackamas County. We have smaller cities and reducing it by two for the county means that potentially limits the opportunity for our various cities to apply vs Portland that if they are reduced by two still have a handful they can submit as a city. We wouldn't want that automatic reduction in the number of applications that are accepted to impact negatively small cities. Again, it would be helpful to know, ha the number of applications truly hindered the process, has this been a problem in the past and how will this help the process run better.

Jay Higgins noted we shared concerns that Ms. Buehrig, Mr. Farley and Mr. Hesse brought up around the adjustment of project sizes. It was agreed we don't have info to make a decision about whether those are problems or not. Maybe the idea of getting just bigger projects is great but we haven't seen enough to know if we are actually solving that problem by changing those numbers. I want to bring up a different piece which was around the design criteria. I didn't understand what design criteria was going to do. My assumption is that when you get your RFFA grant your grant agreement tells you that you must design to the Metro design guide. Could you tell me what the design guide piece is going to do and how that works?

Mr. Leybold note that's something we can come back with more explanation. Generally, when you apply and you're putting in a particular facility, you need to comply with the guidelines, but you don't necessarily have to put in a facility that would be consistent. There's also lots of flexibility in

the design guidelines. If you have limited right of way, for example, you can get the exception of not including a particular element. But including that element could get you additional points in some of the particular rating of the project application. I think that's what we were trying to get at, is pull that out from its inclusion in the different RTP goal areas because that wasn't as clear. If you did include those that could provide you that flexibility of getting more credit when that particular design element applies to multiple goals. Mr. Higgins agreed with the idea when things reach multiple goals. I'd like to see more about it because not all our past applications have been that level of detail. Know that influenced your score means you do a lot more design work of flow.

Sarah Iannarone wanted to comment on the program direction options and the technical evaluation and design criteria. Since I'm a community rep at this table it is important to remember that equity priority communities are not a monolith. I think we will want to explicate some of that community priorities being established, especially if there are competing demands across different sets of needs. So we want to be clear about how we do that work because to do it thoroughly I think we have to be transparent and accountable in that as well. A little bit more clarity on that would be helpful further down in the climate action.

Let me back up to safe systems. When you see that you have reduced fatal and serious injury crashes for all modes of travel, and we're going to carry those criteria over into the next RFFA cycle, I wonder what the consequences will be. Since we're carry forward criteria and we've had investments in the past and we're not seeing reductions in fatal and serious injury crashes, I wonder if there's any consequence when our partners and jurisdictions have applied for these funds and that our serious injuries and crashes continue to increase. I would be nice to see accountability in terms of Vision Zero in the safe systems approach because if we're not actually reducing fatal and serious injuries and crashes through our investments then we will need to recalibrate. I think accounting with funding for safe systems and effectiveness would be better to understand.

Another question I had was about increasing the stability of existing critical transportation infrastructure under the climate action resilience category. I wonder if that's for all modes equally again, or if it's for our priority multimodal modes. Low carbon modes and freight, or if motor vehicle and drive alone trips were included in that because there are different levels of stability, for instance roadways where certain types of movement is prioritized, where we might want to not prioritize spending, maintaining infrastructure for drive alone trips, but we would want to maintain infrastructure for multimodal and other types of travel. Again, clarifying critical to whom and for what mode.

Another concern, following up on Mr. Higgins point around the design criteria and how we're going to implement that here would be the part about supporting future population employment growth demands. One of the things I've seen over time is us defer defaulting to VMT reduction per capita to accommodate for population growth, which doesn't actually reduce our overall VMT as a region. I understand that VMT per capita is what we're trying to address through the 2023 RTP update or at least what's ensconced there. But I think that supporting future population growth shouldn't just entail driving age just having that growth be accommodated in terms of SOV trips. I want to make sure that VMT per capita, as we have it outlined in the RTP update, isn't actually increasing our VMT overall if we're accommodating for population growth.

Indi Namkoong agreed with Ms. Iannarone's point - who is included in "the community" (or who isn't) is a critical data point if we're claiming there's community support for a project. Evaluating the

response is still likely somewhat holistic, but at minimum applications should demonstrate how project sponsors are answering that question, make sure it's not just a "yes/no" box to check. Mr. Hesse appreciated this point. I also wonder about connecting that measure to the priority investment categories identified during the 2023 RTP update through the focused community engagement.

Mike McCarthy wanted to add to a concern brought up about the limit on the number of applications. We have a lot of cities in Washington County, and we also anticipate the county submitting multiple applications for valid projects. A couple of our cities are big and could have multiple applications within them. And with these numbers it looks like we'd be in a position where we'd have to tell a city we're unable to forward their application. We need to make sure that we allow enough applications to get all the valid projects in. We don't want to have to cut off valid projects.

Mr. Leybold noted with what we've done in the past the limit was high enough last cycle that this wasn't an issue at the county coordinating committee level. I know in cycles before that there have been discussions at the county coordinating committee level where if it looked like there were more applications coming in than the limit, then the county coordinating committee sorted out what the priorities were for submission. Mr. McCarthy noted he understood the desire to reduce the number that have to go through the scoring process and have to be reviewed, but I think reducing it in that level particularly for counties like ours that have lot of cities is a problem. I can understand asking within particular agencies for them to prioritize but asking for a city "A" gets their application submitted and city "B" doesn't is a problem.

Eric Hesse wanted to follow up on the thread around the sub regional limits. Clarification was asked what the proposed number would be for each sub region. Mr. Leybold noted that in the last cycle any of the sub regions didn't meet the maximums and would have been good under the proposal for a reduced amount. The technical assistance and the pre-application concept options were noted. It was asked if the intent for Metro staff with the pre-application is tied to those interested in technical assistance. Is it voluntary, maybe like TGM where you get some pre-review and some support, or is it a new requirement that would be for all intending to apply? If so, what is expected at this point?

Mr. Leybold noted we haven't talked through whether to make that a requirement or not. I think the initial idea as part of it if we're going to provide additional technical assistance to small jurisdictions so that there would be some way to help with that. It might be mandatory for someone to fill out a letter of intent to get them qualified for that technical assistance so that we knew how to scope that technical assistance and budget for it. I don't think we have internally discussed or made any commitment around whether it would be a new requirement for everybody vs voluntary.

Mr. Hesse thought from Portland's perspective the more voluntary as pipeline toward technical assistance would be preferable because this is a pretty quick process already and we are on a tight timeline to be prioritizing internally with the projects that we think we should be developing to advance. This would imply another additional early step for the coordinating committees. And project endorsement with council action could be problematic. We appreciate trying to help respond to those clear requests you've gotten around providing some additional technical assistance. A question was asked regarding funding dependency around this technical assistance money. Could you add more clarity around how the timeline or proves for that is intended to work. Is that something you're hoping to specify how much funding and from where in this program direction.

Mr. Leybold noted it would somehow come out of the federal funds that get allocated to us, and I'd hope to make that decision by this summer. I don't think we'd have all the details nailed down as part of the project direction decision in June or July, but we'd have a good description of it, and certainly better understanding.

Mr. Hesse noted from our perspective we appreciate the intent and interest, especially smaller jurisdictions recognizing that Portland has some more capacity than others. It was noted to keep an eye on how big that pot becomes relative to the grants we're trying to award. I wouldn't want to spend all the money on the application process or not all the money, but a significant chunk of the application process constraining them, what we can do with the funds, implementation wise.

The last point I'd make is regarding the design criteria. I appreciate the questions being raised and Metro's intent to help. I think some of the benefits are compelling and interested in ensuring additional clarity. Moving forward we would want to encourage best practice, building on the important livable streets, guides and others while also being context sensitive, including recognizing where some of those practices just aren't physically possible in right of ways and those various things, ensuring they are embedded in those guides in the process to date, but making sure that appropriate level of contact sensitivity doesn't unnecessarily punish projects while trying to still reward those that are implementing best practices when they have that option.

Mr. Leybold noted the numbers that people are interested in specifically were found regarding previously limitations. If we reduce the number of applications by two for everybody as proposed, that would be 10 applications for the City of Portland, nine applications for Washington County and their jurisdictions, eight applications for Clackamas County and their jurisdictions, and seven applications for East Multnomah County. That is what they would be if we move forward as written in the proposal.

Allison Boyd wanted to add to the discussion about the minimum funding request. I would want to see a little bit more about if we are solving a problem. I think the project development one particularly would be good to look at if that's necessary. I wonder if it would hinder how nimble we are in the late stages of the selection process and using all of the funding and being able to allocate those smaller amounts after we've picked the projects. That would be good to look at a little bit more. I wanted to get more information about how you're looking at the part about projects which received funding for construction would be ineligible in the next cycle. I'm not sure how you're defining projects because I think for us part of our strategy a lot of times might be to phase out work along the same corridor because we won't be able to get the full amount that we need for the corridor in one shot. So we'll have projects to go along. Would you be considering that the same project or are you just looking specifically if we needed to come back and ask for more money to complete a project with that scope of work from the previous cycle?

Mr. Leybold noted I think what we're intending is the latter. If you said you were going to build something but then coming back this cycle and saying we were \$3 million short of what we said it was going to cost that wouldn't be eligibility to need to wait another cycle. Again, this would be for construction awards, not for if you received a project development award in the last cycle, you could certainly come back this cycle and ask for construction phase. Ms. Boyd agreed that made sense. But it would also make me want to look at some kind of process we have in those later stages of the selection since a lot of times the amount that an agency will request can't be fulfilled. There's kind of that decision to do you want to take a smaller amount and then you might get into your project and

realize that's not going to work. You can always reduce the scope, but I would want to consider how that affects the offers that are made on the requests from the funding allocation perspective. I would add the items that are added to the criteria under the goals areas makes sense. However, it will depend a lot on the specifics of how those are measured. I look forward to getting more information on that as we move forward in the process.

Dyami Valentine wanted to reinforce the concerns raised earlier about limiting the number of applications sub regionally. Ditto to those comments. Especially for Washington County and Clackamas County where we have multiple jurisdictions and other partners that are going to be seeking funding that is a hamper to limiting those opportunities. As far as the design criteria goes, I appreciate and will build on what Mr. Hesse noted with the aspect of context sensitivity being important. I appreciate the concern Ms. Iannarone raised and would want to maybe reframe that as I think it's important to account for future land use considerations and accounting for that future context or aspirational context. I appreciate that element. I think that might be the intent of what that criteria were looking at so maybe just reframe that a little bit.

In terms of the cycle objectives, I agree with the concerns raised in terms of the minimum threshold increases. I think especially around project development maybe just offering some clarity around increasing the threshold changes with the scope of project development. Maybe we need to frame what the expectations around where projects be as a region what we're hoping to get projects to X level of design or readiness. Some additional thinking on that if that's the intent. Otherwise, it does present a pretty substantial barrier to advancing priority projects especially for our smaller jurisdictions.

I agree with Mr. Hesse's comments and have questions around the process and capacity for incorporating a pre-application process just because that does add some additional layers and making sure those conversations are effective and robust. Does Metro have staff capacity to be able to provide that feedback in a meaningful and timely manner? Maybe you could articulate what that might look like from a timing standpoint. I think that would help in providing additional direction.

Mr. Leybold acknowledged there was a lot of information given to the committee today and appreciated all the input received. If you have additional thoughts or want to provide additional clarity you can reach out to myself or Grace Cho. There will be more discussions next month where hopefully responses to these inputs can be presented. The TPAC workshop on April 10 is regarding the process. The focus of that workshop is going to be on further explanations of the benefits and outcomes that have been achieved through the different Step One B statewide programs and planning activities. You've had one of those briefings at the last workshop from the Transit Oriented Development program. We will run through the other programs and the regional planning activity, corridor planning activity as well.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:17 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, April 5, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	4/5/2024	4/5/2024 TPAC Agenda	040524T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	3/29/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 3/29/2024	040524T-02
3	Memo	3/25/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments: Mid-February through mid-March 2024	040524T-03
4	Draft Minutes	3/1/2024	Draft minutes from TPAC March 1, 2024	040524T-04
5	Draft Resolution 24-XXXX	N/A	Draft Resolution 24-XXXX FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING FIVE NEW PROJECTS TO THE 2024-27 MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	040524T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-XXXX	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-XXXX	040524T-06
7	Staff Report Memo to Resolution 24-XXXX	3/28/2024	To: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: April FFY 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-53XX Approval Request	040524T-07
8	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1: Curve Warning Scoping List	040524T-08
9	Memo	3/29/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2024-25 Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) - Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5399	040524T-09
10	RESOLUTION NO. 24-5399	N/A	RESOLUTION NO. 24-5399 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2024-25 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AND CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	040524T-10
11	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5399	March 2024	Exhibit A: DISCUSSION DRAFT 2024-2025 Unified Planning Work Program	040524T-11
12	Exhibit B to Resolution 24-5399	N/A	Exhibit B: 2024 Metro Self-Certification	040524T-12

13	Staff Report for Resolution 24-5399	4/5/2024	STAFF REPORT IN CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO.24-5399, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADOPTING THE FISCAL YEAR 2024-25 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AND CERTIFYING THAT THE PORTLAND METROPOLITAN AREA IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS	040524T-13
14	Memo	3/29/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Eliot Rose, Senior Transportation Planner and Kim Ellis, AICP, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Potential approaches to Federal greenhouse gas emissions reduction target setting and performance monitoring	040524T-14
15	Reports	N/A	WSDOT and ODOT State Initial GHG Target Reports	040524T-15
16	Fact Sheet	April 2023	OREGON TRANSPORTATION EMISSIONS Website Analysis Factsheet	040524T-16
17	Handout	2/22/2024	Coordinated Timeline for Meeting New Federal Greenhouse Gas Performance Measure and Target Setting Requirements	040524T-17
18	Memo	3/29/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner, Metro Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager, Metro RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Program Direction Options for Step 1 and Step 2	040524T-18
19	Attachment 1	3/23/2024	Attachment 1 – Summary of Input Received on the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) Program Direction	040524T-19
20	Attachment 2	N/A	Attachment 2 Supplemental RFFA Program Information – Response to Step 1 Questions	040524T-20
21	Presentation	4/5/2024	March traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	040524T-21
22	Presentation	4/5/2024	April 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-XXXX	040524T-22
23	Presentation	4/5/2024	2024-25 Unified Planning Work Program	040524T-23
24	Presentation	4/5/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Program Direction Overview & Input Received	040524T-24