

Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**
Date/time: Wednesday, April 10, 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
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Marianne Brisson
Sarah Iannarone
Sara Westerlund
Jasia Mosley
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Gresham & Cities of Multnomah County
City of Tualatin & Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
The Street Trust
Oregon Walks
Community Member
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver

Alternates Attending

Sarah Paulus
Graham Martin
Jessica Pelz
Adam Fiss
Francesca Jones
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Dakota Meyer
Gregg Snyder
Kate Lyman
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

Multnomah County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Oregon City & Cities of Clackamas County
City of Lake Oswego & Cities of Clackamas County
City of Troutdale & Cities of Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro & Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Allison Boyd
Jaimie Lorenzini
Tara O'Brien
Laurie Lebowsky-Young

Affiliate

Multnomah County
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
TriMet
Washington State Department of Transportation

Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy
Danielle Casey
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Port of Portland
Community Member
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

A.J. O'Connor
Andrew Mortensen
April Bertelsen
Arini Farrell
Cody Field
Dan Randol
Eve Nilenders
Ian Matthews
Jean Senechal Biggs
Jeff Owen
Kate Freitag
Kelsey Lewis
Matt Novak
Michael Dohn

Affiliate

TriMet
David Evans & Associates
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Multnomah County
City of Tualatin
Oregon Department of Transportation
Multnomah County
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Beaverton
HDR
Oregon Department of Transportation
SMART
Oregon Department of Transportation
TriMet

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Andrea Pastor, Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, Jason Nolin, John Mermin, Kelly Betteridge, Ken Lobeck, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickelberry, Ted Leybold, Tom Kloster

Call to Order and Introductions

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

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Kate Lyman announced TriMet is in coordination with Metro preparing to launch the FX system plan which is building off the great work done on the High-Capacity Transit Study. We are beginning to launch that effort and starting to roll with our consultation team. We hope to reach out to our jurisdictional partners in the coming months to start conversations about that. Another thing to mention in reference to a project I talked about a few months ago which is our long-range service plan we're calling Forward Together 2.0. We're now about to lead into jurisdictional workshops in early May where we'll talk about the details of our future service network in coordination with agency partners. Then I hope to come back later this summer to report on what we heard and where we expect to go to the public this fall.

Ted Leybold announced Metro has a position open on my team for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Data Coordinator. That position is open until May 1. Encouragement was given to share this with your networks. The position description includes help coordinating data, the lead on our new MTIP database and essential help to the MTIP team.

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/oregonmetro/jobs/4454967/mtip-data-coordinator?pagetype=jobOpportunitiesJobs>

Chair Kloster announced Metro has extended the recruitment for Transportation Director position another week. It will essentially oversee the MPO operations at Metro, meaning the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/oregonmetro/jobs/4414413/transportation-planning-and-policy-director?page=2&pagetype=jobOpportunitiesJobs>

Sarah Iannarone noted the Early Bird registration tickets will be wrapping up for the Oregon Active Transportation Summit this Friday. We have confirmed that Rep. Larry Kraft from Minnesota, who was the architect of the Move Minnesota package in 2023 which is one of the countries leading transportation packages on climate and public and active transportation investments, is coming to Oregon to talk to us and help organize our community around richer investments for people walking, biking, rolling and accessing public transportation. Encouragement was given for all to attend.

<https://oregontransportationsummit.org/>

Jean Senechal Biggs announced the City of Beaverton is hiring a Transportation Project Manager to lead an exciting complete street project. Please help spread the word:

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/beaverton/jobs/4422737/transportation-project-manager>

Public Communications on Agenda Items none received

Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, February 14, 2024 (Chair Kloster) The committee was asked to send edits to Marie Miller. With none received the summary as approved as written.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Step 1 Regionwide Programs and Planning Activities Overview (Grace Cho, Marne Duke, Caleb Winter, Noel Mickelberry, Kelly Betteridge, Metro)

Grace Cho provided the introduction for the presentation. This is part of the overall regional flexible fund allocation for the 2028-2030 cycle. We wanted to have what we call the Step One B regionwide programs, as well as regional planning activities come give presentations on some of the work that they've been doing, talk about their program highlights, and help inform the discussions moving into the program direction as we're formulating some different ideas.

Introductions were made for the Transportation System Management and Operations Program update by Caleb Winter, TSMO program manager, Kate Freitag, ODOT Region 1 Traffic Engineer and Chair of TransPort, and AJ O'Connor, Director of Intelligent Transportation Systems for TriMet. TSMO was defined as more efficient use of the existing transportation system through operator partnerships that deploy interoperable technologies. We do this with priorities to reflect the regional policy and planning outcomes. The strategy planning process was described.

A picture of the 2023 RTP Network and map of the National Highway System was shown to enable planning for new technologies to support reliability for safe travel in the region. It was noted past RFFA funds around the region have supported upgrades of transit traffic signaled intersections. A project list from the 2021 TSMO Strategy Solicitation was provided. The TSMO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was noted as going across four areas: Program Management, Program Plus, Accessible, Routable Sidewalk Data, and Program Investment.

AJ O'Connor provided an update on the Next Generation Transit Signal Priority (TSP) including the results from the project, next steps to create intergovernmental agreements that define what's happened and how we move forward with new projects. For upcoming work, the challenges and opportunities were reviewed.

Kate Freitag reviewed the integrated corridor management draft where the I-205 Clackamas County connections and partners will work to improve efficiency of the existing transportation system. Planning work allows us to request funds for strategic operational improvements. Project examples were described. ODOT also supports TSMO related innovations at the statewide level. TransPort and related groups with their roles were described.

Andrew Mortensen asked are TriMet and Portland considering TSP on streetcars as well as LRT? Mr. O'Connor noted the streetcar needs to have a computer capable of producing the TSP Probe data that is sent to the TSP Vendor. Each TriMet bus already had this computer (INIT Co-Pilot PC) on the bus, as part of our bus dispatch system. So, TriMet didn't have to add any new equipment to our buses to implement the new NextGen TSP. Completely coincidentally, Streetcar was already planning to do this (add a PC to the streetcar) for other operational reasons, so once they have that equipment (INIT Co-Pilot PC), we could easily add them to the TSP system.

Metro Investment Areas Manager Kelly Betteridge presented an overview of their programs. Currently they are working on 15 different projects. The investment team works with partners to develop shared investment strategies that help communities build their downtowns, main streets and corridors and that leverage public and private investments that implement the region's 2040 Growth Concept. The investment approach to leverage resources to maximize public benefit and return through shared investment strategies – align local, regional, state, federal, community and private interests to maximize benefits was described. Examples of projects were given including the 82nd Avenue Transit Project and Better Bus.

Noelle Mickelberry and Marne Duke presented information on Metro's Regional Transportation Options programs. The program history, funding and policy was described. The program supports all trips in commute, community, and Safe Routes to Schools program areas. There are three grant tracks that include core and emerging partners (3-year cycle), general grants (annual), and small grants awarded on a rolling basis. A slide showing 2023-2026 RTO Grantees to date was shown.

Metro manages administrative regional coordination for easy to access tools for local programs. Examples were given of regional impact from programs. Next steps planned are program evaluation and regional needs assessment performed at conclusion of each grant cycle that describe impacts, evaluate investments and prioritize program initiatives. The 2019-23 evaluation will be coupled with a Regional TDM Needs Assessment. Next steps with the TDM strategy include new 2023 RTP TDM policies & RMPU, inclusive of all TDM programs in the region project kick-off at the July TPAC meeting.

Comments from the committee:

Neelam Dorman noted going off the budget table in last month's TPAC packet (Table 1. Step 1 Region-wide programs and planning activities - allocation amounts by cycle), where does the funding for the Investment Area Program show up? TSMO and Regional Travel Options have specific line items. Ted Leybold noted the Investment Areas is the core element of the line item labelled "Corridor & System Planning" on that table.

Eric Hesse appreciated noting the sidewalk data work which was similar to what the City of Portland had engaged with a while ago. I'd be interested in learning more around that. I appreciated you mentioning coordination with ODOT and wondered if that included coordination with their TPS funding program and the work they're doing what they're calling the multimodal inventories that are going to support TSPs. Because it seems this may be a way that you could help support and compliment that difficult to access set of assets. It was noted the TSP referred to was local transportation system

planning. Caleb Winter noted he was ambitious about what we can add to GIS and help folks plan. In 2016 we updated where all the fiber optics go in the region, and we had partners share what was up to date at that time. We based some regional priorities to fill in gaps where high-speed data wasn't flowing. I see that as helpful to where the smart quarters are out there and what needs to be funded. I hope to have that and all those signal upgrades I showed on the map into information in the local system planning. In terms of funding and support we have had some of the regional mobility policy coordination meetings. In terms of the capacity the SMA program would have for local system planning we would fold what we can really support incorporation of the RTP.

Mr. Hesse noted he was specifically commenting on the emerging program that you were mentioning regarding the adaptive then routing other information. This might be of interest to the inventory with opportunity through the rest of the system. Contact Portland if we can provide any GIS to you from our assets that would be helpful.

Mr. Winter noted there are two data standards on sidewalks. They work together but one is that open street map, the attributes that are available to fill in there that help people with routing, that are incomplete in large areas. One is just going that path and updating that data. That would be open. The other one that the University of Washington would support is Open Sidewalks, another data standard that's a little more detailed. There's a lot of work that would go into proving this data system is ready for people to plan and route and meets multiple needs. It's supposed to be real objective data that people can use based on their ability, whether that's based on the slope of a hill or certainly curbs where curb ramps are. Mr. Hesse added that as we're moving forward with expansion of these important programs, we're contemplating the ongoing operation and maintenance costs and some of the lifecycle costs as well.

Mike McCarthy also had a couple questions about the SMO work. First, appreciation was given for all the amazing work that's going on now to use modern technology and intelligence to help us all move better. A recent meeting with a former TransPort member was noted where discussions included some of the amazing data that they have available, safety crash data, near misses, pedestrian usage, vehicle speeds. There's a significant cost involved with that, and it seems like the kind of thing where attaining this data would make the most sense to have the whole region, or possibly even the whole state purchasing it and using it together. I was wondering what's the process for deciding what to purchase knowing that RX is one of several providers that have amazing data sources. And is that something that's talked about at TransPort and how much has been considered about some of these data sources for use now.

Mr. Winter noted I've been coordinating with Lake McTighe and Kate Gregory on how we show data. We have met with your contact on near miss data from probe vehicles based on mobility, basically GIS services as people travel around. Hillsboro is first in our region to look at the data and find cases of what they could change related to that data. We want a presentation from Hillsboro at some point at TransPort. We did observe that it's fairly high cost. Ms. McTighe is looking at what's the more sustainable way populating data, possibly from the Safe Streets for All grant. We're still in that area of keeping track of it but not yet ready to bring that kind of data source on board.

Mr. McCarthy noted he's been asked why buses get to go to the front of the line and has data been compiled about effects of transit signal priority on the operations of the rest of the intersection and how it affects everybody else. Are there any soft of studies or things you can point to that would answer some of those questions? Mr. O'Connor noted we could send you the on/off study we did because it looked specifically at that. The short answer is that it had an effect but not nearly what

everybody was anticipating. I think that is partially due to PBOT's programming and the ability of the new next generation TSP to give ETS for three intersections ahead, so it's allowed those controllers and those intersections to process all the other phases before the bus got there. The impact was minimal which is great. But that's just one route. The challenge is going to get greater when we implement it.

For example, what Ms. Betteridge was talking about on 82nd Avenue. When you have two major cross streets, the TSP system allow us to have business rules and determine what bus should get priority. So this system has the capability to say this bus is empty, this bus is full, this bus is going down to a major corridor. That bus gets priority over this one. So this new TSP system gives us a lot of flexibility to work with our partners and to work internally at TriMet to determine, as we expand this, what bus gets priority or gets to the head of the line. The larger argument about why buses get to the head of the line is one that you've probably seen lots of graphics. We carry a lot more people for less emissions and if we want to do something about climate change that's the answer. It was asked which SCAT system you are coordinating with. Mr. O'Connor noted we're not coordinating with any right now. We're in the early phases of discussing with SCATs what it would take to implement TSP in a SCAT system.

Karen Buehrig thanked the presenters for the information. I think that these programs have been so important across time. In Clackamas County the Safe Routes to School program and being able to have access to the funding through Metro has allowed us to both build and maintain that across time which has been essential. There's been a lot of support Metro has been able to give the County around its travel options work. I think the TSMO is increasing importance as we're trying to figure out how we can make our existing systems function better.

A couple of things you pulled out with the transit signal priority element, such as how can we make sure that we're using our system really well and getting the most out of achieving carbon reduction. Think the corridor program is also important. I'm glad Ms. Dorman asked the question about the table and where we can see the amounts of money that we anticipate designating within these different programs. We are thinking about the upcoming Regional Flexible Funds program and the way the table is structured now it looks like there's going to be less investments across time in that corridor program. As the table notes, I think there are some one-time investments in this current round. I think people need to recognize that program won't be funded to the same level that we are becoming used to.

I have in the past and currently am interested in how projects end up being selected to be part of either ones that Metro manages or Metro's a partner in for the corridor program. As we heard today both the TSMO program and the Safe Routes to Schools program have processes that different jurisdictions can have to be able to access funding for those programs. I think in the past there has been a tight relationship with high-capacity transit in the corridor program. It was noted in the presentation shared investment strategies. Are there parts of our region that really need those shared investment strategies for all modes of transportation and not just high-capacity transit. We need to be able to achieve our goals in those parts of the region that perhaps aren't right for high-capacity transit, but they still need this type of work. Maybe you can talk a little bit about how projects are selected to be part of the program.

Kelly Betteridge noted the best way for me to describe at a high level what we've been doing to date and how projects have evolved that are currently within our partner bucket where we have perhaps 12 to 15 projects. Those are usually specific to a request from a jurisdiction simply for us to play a role in a project or a process. We assign capacity based on those requests. I think we'll always have time and space for those types of projects that we want to make sure that Metro is an engaged partner in these larger processes throughout the region. In regard to the more larger corridor projects where we are

making investments to date, most of those have been transit driven and typically with the intention of seeking Federal Transit Administration, capital investment grant dollars. That ends up often being where we focus the need for catalyzing local dollars to get to those federal dollars. In the example that you were sort of laying out at a high level we would need perhaps a different path forward.

I would say from where I sit, I think of it as we are focused on projects that come out of the regional process and plans, so typically HCT plans. Then what ultimately ends up happening is some ripeness around both funding and champions. About 82nd Ave there was already quite a bit of funding that had been made available to our partners at PBOT and ODOT, and this was an opportunity to build on that momentum. About TV Highway we applied for a federal grant and that was the seed that helped us to also leverage our focus there. It's not a formula per se, but those are the types of opportunities that we tend to focus on in regard to selecting both projects that rank highly within our region process, and opportunity that arises from a funding. When I say champion, I mean local jurisdiction for which they want to make this a priority project.

Ms. Buehrig noted I think the evolution of transportation funding has evolved across time and with knowing that there's a whole suite of different federal investments that would benefit from this kind of partnership and support behind how we get to that project. I think about things like the connection between 172nd and 190th, the connector project. Local jurisdictions in the past spearheaded what was called the Clackamas to Columbia Corridor project that helped at least emphasize the different investments that were needed. But in order to achieve those large dollar investments I think we're going to need something more. I would advocate that this corridor project program look for ways to include other types of projects or corridors that may not be just high-capacity transit but would benefit from that additional lift needed to see those large dollar investments happen.

Gregg Snyder noted just to reflect back a little bit, the RFFA Step 1 allocation I remember hearing that we're going to increase it by 3%. That's been the traditional trajectory. The presentations today made me think about what happens if we change that ratio. In other words, maybe decrease one of those programs and maybe supercharge another one that we might be more interested in. I want to just plant a seed that what we have in the Step 1 that's not bonds are elective, optional things and we can change those if we want, or we could decide what the priority is for a corridor study and whether it's a transit study or a true multimodal study. I encourage some thinking around do we just set these things in stone and let them grow 3% per year for the remainder of the time here or is it time for an adjustment that we could look at these individualized programs and maybe make some tweaks because the region wants to try to do something greater or more concentrated.

Five-minute break was taken in the meeting.

TriMet and SMART Budget Updates and Programming of Projects

SMART (Kelsey Lewis) A brief overview of the Smart Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART) program was provided. The 2024-25 transit fund forecast was shown with a proposed revenue of nearly \$10 million. This budget is expected to be adopted June 3. Descriptions of the proposed program of projects was provided.

TriMet (Kate Lyman & Michael Dohn) The FY2025 budget investments were described. The FY 2025 resources and requirements were shown. A list of federal externally funded operating and capital improvement programs were shown. The budget timeline was provided with the TriMet Board expected to adopt the FY2025 Budget May 22nd. More information about the budget can be found on the TriMet website: trimet.org/budget/

Comments from the committee:

Chair Kloster asked Ms. Lewis about the training series for older transit riders mentioned in the presentation, and how this addressed barriers for seniors. Do you track participants from the training and has it had an impact with access for transit? Ms. Lewis noted we don't have a formal program evaluation with numbers tracked, but we have some anecdotal evidence that it does help people. The training is a small-scale operation and it's for older adults and people with disabilities. There are also plenty of children going to school who have disabilities, and this applies for them as well. It doesn't always translate to folks using transit more, but it does. It's interesting to see the crossover with grandparents wanting to take their kids and grandkids to programs, which helps them learn to ride transit. We used to fund targeted marketing around light rail openings, but we learned we needed to periodically refresh people who may be new to the neighborhood or never stepped on transit and were wary with options for regional travel.

Karen Buehrig asked a question on the TriMet presentation. There was one slide that talked about the various revenues and there was the pie chart and it had tax revenues broadly described. There was also another line that talked about STIF, and the STIF line seemed small. I was wondering if those tax revenues were both kind of employer tax as well as employee tax grouped together, or if it was the employee tax that was in that other line that was labeled STIF? Mr. Dohn noted the tax revenue, the big purple part of that pie chart is our employer payroll tax, self-employment payroll tax, and state payroll tax. The STIF employee tax is that smaller bucket. It is a much smaller revenue source in comparison to the employee payroll tax.

Gregg Snyder noted just in the last 18 months we've seen presentations from all different kinds of agencies at all different levels of government, basically saying that budgets are strapped at the city level, at the county level. We've seen it at the state level with some huge funding holes. I haven't heard that from TriMet, and I'm wondering maybe you're the one agency that's immune from this long-term trend. Has the agency done a long-term fiscal forecast for the next 5 to 10 years, and looked at where we land? Are you in the positive or the negative? I haven't heard any alarm bells yet so I assume that it's in the positive, but if you could give some thoughts in that direction that would be appreciated.

Mr. Dohn noted TriMet is not immune to any of that either. We're not as boisterous about it yet because we're trying to mitigate it and do things in different ways. Our fiscal cliff is between 2031, 2032, so the early part of the next decade with the stimulus and with the health of our employer payroll tax revenues. They did not grow how they were predicted prior to the pandemic but they have still been a stable revenue source for us. That said, we are like everyone else. We might not be able to grow service quite the way that we want to in the future. The light rail system is around 40 years old and will be challenged to fund and maintain that. If we see a downturn in the economy, we see jobs start to go away, or the wage growth itself starts to go away we will need to adjust. The one-time federal stimulus revenue of around \$650 million will be shrinking which affect our agency as it does others.

Sarah Iannarone noted historically investments for people walking, biking and rolling are generally curtailed over time to meet our economic reality. Where our investments in things like highway mega projects tend to exceed our local and current economic reality. Acknowledgement was given to the providers for trying to meet these needs even when budgets are tight. It was noted from our conversations at the HB2017 STIF Advisory Committee and other tables one of the things that we're going to need to talk about in the future is transit safety. What we're hearing in a lot of community engagement is that it's not just the service areas or frequencies which are either making it easier for people to ride transit or a more difficult safety issue. Whether that's perceived or actual, I think is a

really big problem for a lot of people in our communities. They're very concerned about their personal safety just as we see in other public spaces. We may have to be creative in how we're going to fund some of that as well if we're going to keep our system moving along. We don't have dedicated mechanisms as a society to ensure peoples' safety in those ways that work for them. That's a concern that we're hearing from a lot of people that we interface with.

Ted Leybold noted this is a reminder this is all part of that development of the MTIP process. TriMet and SMART both submit their draft programming of these federal funds into the MTIP itself. They've been incorporated in the past when we adopted the MTIP cycle originally. But then as the federal funds actually get more precise with the actual appropriation of those funds, we will refine the programming in the MTIP to reflect what these agencies adopt in their budget. You may see information about that in Mr. Lobeck's monthly report of administrative adjustments to those amounts of funds that they've presented today. It has been the opportunity to share how they're using these funds for programs.

ODOT Federal Functional Classification Update (Glen Bolen, ODOT) An overview of the Federal Functional Classification was presented. The importance of this was defined as:

- Functional classification defines the role the roadway plays in serving travel needs.
- Federal legislation uses FFC to determine eligibility for funding for most FHWA funding categories, including Federal Aid.
- Functional classification carries with it expectations about roadway design, including its speed, capacity and relationship to existing and future land use development.
- Consistency between adjacent jurisdictions

The schedule of the FFC, roles and responsibilities with MPO partners and regional planners, an outline of a sample process and general guidance resources was given. General guidance tips included:

- While functional classification applies to both existing and planned facilities, the **focus is on the existing system and "near-term" improvements** (in the STIP and will be under construction within 4 years).
- **Jurisdictions should review their entire roadway system.** This includes roads currently classified as part of the local system in case they should be part of the federal functional classification system (federal aid eligible).
 - Keep the focus on how a given roadway currently functions (existing road) or is intended to function (planned road).
 - Don't forget about how roads, and other transportation facilities, fit into the local system and connect to adjacent communities.
 - Remember that federal FC standards are sometimes very different than the FC system a local agency uses in their TSP.

The ODOT Functional Classification Change Request Form can be submitted by document filled in form via https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Data/Documents/FC_Change_Request_Instructions.pdf or online via a link from YouTube with instructions: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PN1oMAG3Re0> The deadline to submit all FCC updates is June 30.

Comments from the committee:

Dyami Valentine appreciated the overview. Clarification was asked on road authority. In the example of Murray Blvd. given, the county has road authority. Would we be the one that would be offering the update on those classifications? Mr. Bolen noted anybody can submit something if they think something has changed, but because it's an open-ended platform that way we're not locking anything down. I think that the people who own and operate the facilities are the ones with the most

knowledge. If we had a situation where a city also made a comment we'd just loop back and check and try to see what the differences might have been. Mr. Valentine agreed we'd want to be coordinated and avoid duplicate efforts.

Mike McCarthy noted contrary to Mr. Bolen's initial comments about the interest level for this topic, I think we will want to invite you to our county coordinating committee TAC to talk about is to some of the other cities that need to hear it.

Karen Buehrig appreciated the fact this presentation was given not only today but at the Clackamas County Coordinating Committee TAC as well. One of the things about filling in a form is that when the jurisdiction does so it has a record of what they submitted. Do you know if this online tool could capture back all of the edits that maybe a jurisdiction has submitted? So there is a record of what was done. Mr. Bolen noted there will be a record of the whole thing. Andrew Mortensen with David Evans & Associates has developed this online sortable database. It was noted in the chat the most recent Proposed Metro Boundary (2024) is embedded in the online map.

Adjournment

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:45 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, April 10, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	4/10/2024	4/10/2024 TPAC Workshop Agenda	041024T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	4/4/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 4/4/2024	041024T-02
3	Minutes	2/14/2024	Minutes for TPAC workshop, 2/14/2024	041024T-03
4	Memo	4/3/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 1B – Region-wide Programs and Planning Activities	041024T-04
5	Presentation	4/10/2024	SMART: MTIP Coordination and Program of Projects	041024T-05
6	Presentation	4/10/2024	TriMet FY2025 Approved Budget	041024T-06
7	Presentation	4/10/2024	ODOT Federal Functional Classification Update	041024T-07
8	Memo	3/25/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: Proposed Project Delivery Training Session #2 – Project Scoping	041024T-08
9	Presentation	4/10/2024	Transportation System Management & Operations Program Update and Regional Implementation	041024T-09
10	Presentation	4/10/2024	Investment Areas Program Overview	041024T-10
11	Presentation	4/10/2024	Metro Regional Travel Options	041024T-11
12	Web Link	4/10/2024	Web link for agenda item: ODOT Federal Functional Classification update	041024T-12