



# Meeting minutes

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**

Date/time: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

---

**Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Allison Boyd  
Dyami Valentine  
Judith Perez Keniston  
Eric Hesse  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Jay Higgins  
Mike McCarthy  
Tara O'Brien  
Chris Ford  
Gerik Kransky  
Laurie Lebowsky-Young  
Lewis Lem  
Bill Beamer  
Marianne Brisson  
Sarah Iannarone  
Jasia Mosley  
Indi Namkoong  
Ashley Bryers  
Katherine Kelly

**Affiliate**

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

**Alternates Attending**

Jamie Stasny  
Sarah Paulus  
Mark Lear  
Dayna Webb  
Will Farley  
Gregg Snyder  
Neelam Dorman  
Glen Bolen

**Affiliate**

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

**Members Excused**

Karen Buehrig  
Sara Westersund  
Steve Gallup  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Danielle Casey

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
Oregon Walks  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration

**Guests Attending**

Adam Torres  
Amy Fandrich  
Andrew Mortensen  
Arini Farrell  
Dan Randol  
Dennis Gelfand  
Henry Miller  
Ian Matthews  
Jan Black  
Jenn Glueck  
Justin Bernt  
Kathryn Doherty-Chapman  
Katie Gillespie  
Liz Rickles  
Mark Hardeman  
Matt Novak  
Michael Weston  
Nick Fortey  
Peter Swinton  
Randall Olsen  
Rob Wattman  
Scott Hoelscher  
Tiffany Hamilton  
Trevor Sleeman

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
TriMet  
David Evans & Associates  
Multnomah County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
City of Tigard  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
TriMet  
City of Gresham  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Portland Bureau of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
City of King City  
Federal Highway Administration  
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District  
Community Action of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation

**Metro Staff Attending**

Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Grace Stainback, John Mermin, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, 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** - none received

**Public Communications on Agenda Items** - none received

**Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, April 10, 2024** (Chair Kloster) The committee was asked to send edits to Marie Miller. With none received the summary as approved as written.

**ODOT Update on Funding Allocations for 2028-30 (Leverage, ARTS, etc.) and preview of forthcoming ODOT MTIP amendments** (Chris Ford, ODOT) It was reported there are no new updates at this time with the funding allocations for 2028-30 STIP. More may be offered later this year. The second part of the agenda addressed the 2024-27 STIP upcoming amendments. The TIP amendments were described as (1) Rebalancing / cashflow and delivery relating to largely administrative amendments and slips in schedules, and (2) Construction “bucket” allocations with funding handling through OTC annual

amendment. Examples of the construction bucket allocations were given. Two others of note were given: an amended project with additional funds added to the project, and a new project for safety improvements funded from Region 1 Safety reserve.

Ken Lobeck added these are primarily ODOT managed and funded projects. This will not impact any of the regional flexible fund allocation projects. We will be doing a separate review of those as part of the end of the year review about projects as part of the slips. We may be doing things parallel to that, but these are ODOT reviews of their projects that will go forward. Mr. Ford noted the amount of detail and partnerships to make these things happen. It's complex at times with a lot of documentation, so I'm grateful for all the work.

### **2028-30 RFFA – Step 2 Evaluation Performance Measures Evaluation Criteria: Discussion of**

**Refinements and Inputs** (Grace Cho & Ted Leybold, Metro) The 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Step 2 overview was presented. The main objective is to advance the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Other cycle objectives include:

- Federal eligibility and/or state requirements
- E.g. No sub-allocation, CMAQ eligible projects, air quality
- Federal aid process and project delivery considerations
- Efficiently and cost-effectively navigate federal funds
- Multiple objectives

Step 2 evaluation criteria, performance measures and methods was presented. Next Steps in the Step 2 RFFA Process was reviewed.

Comments from the committee:

Henry Miller with the City of Tigard asked how will RFFA recommendations from prior years be advanced or evaluated through the next RFFA process? Ms. Cho noted that as part of the program direction for this cycle, what's been acted on by TPAC but not yet acted on by JPACT or adopted, is that projects that received construction funding in the 2025-27 allocation are ineligible to apply. Redistribution is kind of an open opportunity to address any cost overruns that we're starting to see or recognizing that there's been a theme on any project these days within transportation, outside transportation, project development. If you're awarded project development funding last cycle you can apply again, in a sense, seeking to move forward the next phase of work. They will get evaluated through the same process that's been outlined. It's not taking scores from the last cycle. We're applying an updated lens. It will need to go through that full evaluation.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted looking at the RTP goal for mobility options and it seems heavily weighted down toward adding things to the corridor. I'm curious if there might be space for us to also include optimizing the existing system to reflect projects that have intelligent transportation system components or transportation demand management components or want to some kind of traffic calming as part of their construction project. I don't know if that would be something that we could incorporate or would be useful. Ms. Cho noted some of those elements are better reflected in the climate goal area. This is part of where I've struggled thinking through some of the performance measures, of duplication of measures, which you'll see in some cases are consistent or are the same measure maybe in each goal, like a land use component. I'm open to feedback on that.

Eric Hesse noted reflecting on that question, which I appreciate trying to make sure those types of approaches are generally supported within mobility options. I do see both Complete Streets Design and technology strategies increase transit reliability. Maybe they need to be TSP related, but one could

imagine other signal improvements that could do that as well as freight barrier removal and other pieces. From my perspective you might be able to fit some of those strategies in that category as well as drafted. As you noted, there are a lot of geographic and other types of quantitative sort of threshold types of issues that we say are above the regional average or other things. For example, pointing to the economic value atlas. I guess you wanted to clarify Metro's intent around being able to provide maps or other resources. You are offering more technical assistance this time around. If there's more you could say around how you're planning to approach supporting local jurisdiction's ability to readily understand how to apply those criteria would be helpful for us looking ahead.

Ms. Cho noted missing a whole point that was meant to be made in the presentation about noting that a number of these performance measures are coming from a starting point of the last cycle in Step 2. That's the base and there's been some revisions that have happened along the way. Similar to last cycle we'll be providing an application and applicant handbook to walk you through the process. We are looking at past resource lists and what can be updated. Several of the geographic ones Metro will be doing verification work in terms of equity focus areas. We are well aware we need to ensure that we provide a number of resources to be able to support responding to these applications because this is what we're evaluating.

Mike McCarthy wanted to support something heard earlier about making sure that we give adequate recognition for projects that increase the efficiency of the existing system that helps us get the most out of what's already there. Or maybe small improvements that can make things better for the whole, like a big stretch of a corridor. Along with adding new some of the things like optimizing signal performance. The other point was I saw a fair amount about equity focus areas, and a lot of measures prioritizing investments specifically in the equity focus areas. But I'd also like to see those recognized projects or give points for serving the equity focus areas when it's a prime connection. For example, between the equity focus neighborhood and nearby jobs, stores and transit, and things that make those connections for people to get to what they really need.

Jay Higgins noted remembering the process being smooth last time, and referring to Mr. Hesse's questions around resources, those were much appreciated because as you're trying to find specific answers to where the criteria are that was super helpful. For the next RFFA I feel we've gotten so complicated. Everything has so many measures. I'm wondering how comfortable you are when we have a high scoring project. Is it really projects that are scoring high across all the criteria, because we're meeting all five goals? We want things that compound on each other and really meet all the goals for the region. Or is it that we're seeing that you could score high in two categories and that's enough to get you over the threshold line, but you've not done much in the other categories. It makes me wonder have we gotten so complex and there's so many criteria that we're starting to lose our connection to those five goals in some way. It seems like maybe we should find a way to simplify.

Ted Leybold noted in previous cycles there was discussion about how to deal with projects that maybe focused on a particular outcome or two relative to across the whole spectrum of what we're trying to achieve. I think the policy in the past from the RTP that we've carried forward in the RFFA process has been to try to achieve multiple objectives with all our investments. I think we've taken that as guidance. In the process we've also left the door open to projects that perform extremely well in one or two categories but maybe don't have a large impact on other categories as still being able to compete. I think we've tried to achieve that kind of a balance, but we'll definitely look at that and think about that as we're doing the evaluation. Generally I would say the existing policy is to try to achieve results across all the RTP goal areas. Mr. Higgins agreed that's exactly what we want. And I think this does achieve

that. It just seems like maybe in places where you could hit one criteria and it might help you and it follow the effect of doing three other things. So you don't need to measure all five of those criteria.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted she wanted to see every project in our region be successful. I know RFFA can't fund all possible projects. I wonder if under the design category if there might be a nexus for us to start including a little blurb about how our transportation projects relate to housing as a potential nexus for the next time the governor wants to invest in housing because that's her priority. We can trot out some of these projects that have high housing impacts and seek leverage funding and it almost creates a pseudo pipeline potential. Just how we talk about our projects within the framework of housing to chase after additional funding.

Eric Hesse appreciated the interest in being able to tell the housing story where appropriate and helping us achieve those important goals the governor has identified. I see in the criteria maybe some opportunity to start lifting this up that people may need to be valuing in the broad category of equitable transportation and then in the areas with lack of access to vehicle, high housing and transportation burden. Some of that is the geography of location in terms of where those places exist. Maybe there's some opportunity there to be acknowledging how those travel options in those areas are maybe helping unlock housing. I'd be interested in making sure that if all the signs are going in the right direction in the way the measures are intended.

For example, one dynamic I could imagine we're struggling with is the way in which it may be that we recognize combined housing and transportation burdens that are equitably distributed. But also know often the sort of being pushed to drive until you qualify dynamic might mean lower than regional average housing costs because centrality often leads to higher housing costs in some cases but the transportation cost swamps that step so the overall burden of housing plus transportation goes up. I'm wondering in part if we're actually wanting to set parity out of the housing and transportation cost burdens or have different modalities within that. In the description of the second column it was suggested to make a better understand about how those will be evaluated.

Ms. Cho noted she believed that measure, if recalled was the data set referred to, was the housing and transportation calculator that's identified through the region. I think this discussion is starting to raise some good questions around maybe rethinking a couple of these performance measures or maybe thinking a little more explicitly and digging deeper into the land use measures that have been identified. Because the land use measures are fairly simple.

Mr. Hesse added that I think if it is coming from the H & T index that might account for some of those dynamics that I was describing already and likely does identify the areas that we are thinking about here. That might address that question. Maybe recognizing there's a description of the vehicle access intensity, for lack of a term, to make sound theory. I wonder if there might also be an associated measure in that area that might define some of those geographies. I can't recall if it was the actual measure. I think in the box just above there is actually the access. I wonder if that just wanted to move down into the next row. If so, the project increases or improves travel options in areas of lower than regional average vehicle access. I think that might want to be in the second row.

Allison Boyd had a question about the specifics of the criteria and a process timeline question. I was remembering the other day that earlier in the year we had also talked about the carbon reduction funds and how those might also either be described as part of the RFFA program direction or something else that would be distributed in the future. I can't remember where that left off and if that is something that is going to be simultaneous to the RFFA allocation process. I'm wondering because I

think there's some overlapping criteria between those two sources and might affect what projects get applied for and each area. I wanted to find out if there was any information about where that falls in the timeline and what the story is on carbon reduction funds.

Ms. Cho noted no details to share. We introduced some of the knowing that we are trying to operate under an assumption that there is a likely second cycle coming. I think right now we can't speak to any details or timeline but clearly that we would be as federal funds need to seek action through TPAC and JPACT for the allocation of those funds. We'll be coming to TPAC when ready to do so. Ms. Boyd noted it sounds like maybe at this point we won't know. That'll be a separate process and it might happen after RFFA at some point? I was just trying to figure out if there would be something where if one project met the carbon reduction criteria, if it'd be moved over to that funding source. But it sounds like the timing of knowing the funding will be too far off, correct?

Mr. Leybold agreed. I think soon after we get this process in place we'll probably have more of a description of the timing of that process. We decided not to join it, if you recall, for a couple of reasons. One is more uncertainty around that funding source relative to the RFFA process. And two, because it comes with its own set of more narrow federal guidance on eligible projects and the purpose of those funds. So it wouldn't fit as neatly in the broader eligibility. Most of our RFFA funds have CMAC funds which constitute about a third of these RFFA funds. It does have a narrower field but not as narrow as carbon. Carbon is obviously carbon reduction and emission reductions is clearly one of our goals in terms of addressing climate for the RFFA funds. So projects will compete well here. But if they don't end up being funded and maybe they're more narrowly targeted type of a project they can come back and apply for or be considered for the carbon reduction funds when we're ready to run that process.

Gregg Snyder noted I'm thinking about most of the RFFA projects in the spirit of this workshop. Maybe this question is a little elementary but thinking about these RFFA projects which are usually standalone, discreet things. But what about if we brought in a project that already has federal aid and local money attached to it and we only need a piece, not the entirety of the thing. We only need like 20% of the funding, maybe \$2 million in a \$10 million funding mix. If we brought in a project in like that as the last funding piece, how would it be treated if it's not a discreet thing? Or is it possible to bring in a highly leveraged project into RFFA of Step 2 for competition. How would that fare in the scoring?

Ms. Cho noted I can think of that kind of fit that have been awarded previously. I want to mention specifically we called out in the program direction projects to receive funding through construction phases in the last cycle, 2025-27, are ineligible to apply for this cycle. There's a different source of funds that those projects that may be running into cost issues, can go to. Not to imply that the project you're speaking to is dealing with cost issues but the example I'm thinking about is Council Creek Regional Trail. It requested project development funding in one cycle. Used that funding but needed more. They were able to take the commitment and support, parlay that into a RAISE grant, but didn't quite completely finish the funding. There was a strong desire to continue the process. The application that came in a following cycle for Capital Creek Trail came in still as a discreet project, but recognizing it was leveraging across the rest of the highly funding projects. I think there is still that opportunity, and nothing currently put in the Step 2 process that would prohibit a project that's highly leveraged to apply. I think it's the shape of that project scope is really critical in terms of defining it well and explicitly as to where the funds would be applied to within that specific portion.

Mr. Leybold added we don't have a lot of those kinds of projects. It certainly would be an eligible activity and we would again, rate the project relative to the scope that's defined for what the RFFA portion would implement. If that can't be teased apart separately as a project element, I think we

would look at trying to judge the project as a whole if that's what seems appropriate. We've had to look and see how you describe that scope. But it's certainly something that can be done and applied for.

Mr. Snyder appreciated the information. One follow on question, maybe just an observation. I think that in this cycle we ought to have something we can point to that's an actual GHG carbon reduction project. I'm thinking about what we could do on a corridor level that we can show we are going to reduce, or try to reduce GHG if it's technology, if it's transit, or something. I like the idea of having a demonstration project for GHG reduction on a corridor basis so that it may only solve one thing in the Metro pantheon of goals, the five goals. But I think there is a project value in doing something in one of those, if we do something bold in one of those, I think that reasonably could be also scored highly. In other words, you don't have to meet everything, but if you do one thing super well you might be able to have a project success. Just something to think about there.

Ken Lobeck added another example of last gap funding where three different types of federal funds on the project with our RFFA funds, and it was scored as a complete project just as a standalone. It didn't seem to have any impact because the Tiger grant was there. I don't see an issue with last gap logic that's coming in for the project.

*Five-minute break was taken in the meeting.*

**Project Delivery Training Series – Scoping for Local Agency Federal-Aid Projects** (Ken Lobeck, Metro, Justin Bernt & Tiffany Hamilton, ODOT) The presentation began with an overview of objectives for planning for successful federal-aid project delivery. Information on when and where to start project scoping was provided. Project development was detailed. General scoping elements covered schedule, budget, problems and proposed solutions, and estimating. The Local Public Agency Federal Aid Project Scoping Checklist and Local Agency Technical Scope Sheet was provided. Details on risk management were covered. Delivery methods and preferred practices were described. ODOT and resources were shared. The full presentation was included in the workshop packet and recording online.

More links for information were provided:

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Business/Pages/AW-Estimation.aspx>

[https://www.oregon.gov/odot/LocalGov/Pages/Forms-Apps.aspx?wp6889=se:%22scop%22,so:\[\[43808,1\]\]](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/LocalGov/Pages/Forms-Apps.aspx?wp6889=se:%22scop%22,so:[[43808,1]])

Local Government page: <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/LocalGov/Pages/index.aspx>

[https://www.oregon.gov/odot/LocalGov/Documents/LPA\\_CertificationStatus.pdf](https://www.oregon.gov/odot/LocalGov/Documents/LPA_CertificationStatus.pdf)

<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/LocalGov/Pages/Certification-User-Group.aspx>

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 11:36 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, June 12, 2024

| Item | DOCUMENT TYPE          | DOCUMENT DATE | DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION  | DOCUMENT No. |
|------|------------------------|---------------|---|--------------|
| 1    | Agenda                 | 6/12/2024     | 6/12/2024 TPAC Workshop Agenda  | 061224T-01   |
| 2    | 2024 TPAC Work Program | 6/6/2024      | 2024 TPAC Work Program as of 6/6/2024   | 061224T-02   |
| 3    | Minutes                | 4/10/2024     | Minutes for TPAC workshop, 4/10/2024  | 061224T-03   |
| 4    | Memo                   | 6/4/2024      | TO: TPAC and interested parties<br>From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead<br>RE: Proposed Project Delivery Training Session #2 – Project Scoping   | 061224T-04   |
| 5    | Memo                   | 6/5/2024      | To: TPAC and interested parties<br>From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner, Metro<br>RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 Evaluation – Draft Performance Measures | 061224T-05   |
| 6    | Presentation           | 6/12/2024     | SCOPING FOR LOCAL AGENCY FEDERAL AID PROJECTS   | 061224T-06   |
| 7    | Presentation           | 6/12/2024     | 24-27 STIP / upcoming amendments  | 061224T-07   |
| 8    | Presentation           | 6/12/2024     | 2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 – Draft Evaluation Performance Measures  | 061224T-08   |