

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday, December 6, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Dyami Valentine
Eric Hesse
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Sara Etter
Jasia Mosley
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly
Michael Sallis
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Metro
Washington County
City of Portland
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community member at large
The Street Trust
Oregon Walks
Community member at large
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Clark County
Washington Department of Ecology

Alternates Attending

Karen Buehrig
Sarah Paulus
Adam Fiss
Francesca Jones
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Gregg Snyder
Tara O'Brien
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
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
TriMet
Washington State Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Jeff Owen
Allison Boyd
Judith Perez Keniston
Kate Lyman
Danielle Casey

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
TriMet
Federal Transit Administration

Guests Attending

Adam Torres
 Adriana Antelo
 Casey Gillespie
 Cody Field
 Jean Senechal Biggs
 Kevin McGrane
 Lekshmy Hirandas
 Mat Dolata
 Matchu Williams
 Max Nonnamaker
 Nick Meltzer
 Taylor Steenblock
 Tiffany Gehrke
 Trevor Sleeman

Affiliate

Clackamas County
 Oregon Department of Transportation
 Oregon Department of Transportation
 City of Tualatin

 City of Happy Valley
 Kittelson & Associates
 City of Hillsboro

 Multnomah County
 Kittelson & Associates
 Multnomah County
 City of Tigard
 Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Abigail Smith, Alex Oreschak, Ally Holmqvist, Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Hanna Howsmon, Jai Daniels, Jake Lovell, Jessica Martin, John Martin, Kadin Mangalik, Kate Hawkins, Ken Lobeck, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matthew Hampton, Max Johnson, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickelberry, 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 around the region – none presented

Monthly MTIP Amendments Update

Chair Kloster noted the memo in the meeting packet providing information on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments for the December 2024 Report. Ken Lobeck can be contacted for further information.

Fatal crashes update (Lake McTighe) The monthly update on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was given. Some of the actions regional partners are taking for safer streets were highlighted:

- Milwaukie: Awarded SS4A funding to study Harrison Street Corridor from 43rd and King intersection through 42nd to Harrison then along Harrison to 99E to improve safety conditions for all users and including transit.
- Portland Bureau of Transportation: Installing a new traffic signal, curb ramps, crosswalks, enhanced street lighting, and sidewalks at NE Columbia Boulevard & 42nd Avenue – two high injury corridors.
- Metro: Published an update to the Fatal and Serious Crash map with 2012-2022 data for the three-county area and profiles of each of the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan top 25 regional high injury corridors.

It was noted scooters are being tracked differently from motorcycles and may be challenging to track data with the changing definitions in reports.

Comments from the committee:

Sarah Iannarone noted the governor's budget for ODOT came out this past week with still about a \$1.75 billion shortfall in that. What is not covered automatically is funding for safety programs across the state. We are going to have to fight in 2025 to make sure that we are funding for things like safe routes to school, complete on-street bike, ped networks, off-street trail systems and complete streets investments. All of us will be in that conversation together and in that fight because many of our neighbors across Oregon don't realize how little relatively we're paying for transportation into the system and how great the needs are, especially for safety programs.

It was noted news received marked Thanksgiving weekend was particularly deadly in the city of Portland, very much like Christmas weekend last year. The City of Portland is on track to surpass last year's traffic fatalities. Knowing it's hard to deliver this news each month, but it's important to keep that front and center in all our conversations because families, livelihoods and communities wellbeing are on the line, and we have to be unrelenting in the fight for safety resources and funding.

Tara O'Brien added a point of clarification on those improvements at 42nd and Columbia. The Portland Bureau of Transportation in partnership with TriMet on our new Columbia bus space that we'll be putting in there. The new signal is also to improve safety for our buses turning as well as it being a high injury corridor. This is as we begin at least that part of construction on the project with the big new facility that will eventually be in 2029.

Laurie Lebowsky-Young asked if a roundabout was considered at that intersection of the project. But after the previous conversation, maybe it had to do with the TriMet bus to have a signal instead of a roundabout. Ms. O'Brien noted I don't know as much about if a roundabout was considered in the design elements, but yes, that's part of why we're putting in a new signal there because we're changing where the gate will be since there will be significant amount of auto and bus traffic going in. But I can look into that and follow up. Eric Hesse added I'm not familiar with the development process of that, but I imagine it is likely anticipating that new development there.

Transit Minute (Ally Holmqvist) The report noted almost 7 million rides in the Metropolitan Statistical Area, about 10% more than this time last year. TriMet has been working to gather community input on two potential transit-oriented developments. The agency is exploring opportunities to reimagine how these sites are used, looking to create benefits for the surrounding neighborhoods while boosting transit access and subsequently ridership. Community input collected will help shape the vision for these locations as part of TriMet's transit-oriented development program.

More Forward Together bus service improvements came to East Multnomah County as of Sunday. TriMet added more buses and introduced weekend service to Line 81. The improved line will now provide weekend service to the Troutdale Reynolds Industrial Park, a major job center, and a small route adjustment means the line will serve more people in Gresham as well. It will extend its reach for regional commuters and destinations for more transit accessibility and encourage new riders.

Last month C-Tran also received environmental clearance for the Highway 99 Bus Rapid Transit project. The agency is gearing up to start construction of the 10-mile 37 station line in the first quarter of next year. That means more fast, frequent, convenient and comfortable connections coming to the region soon. This will be C-Tran's third BRT line and one that connects to the Express Bus to Portland. We are excited for these to bolster ridership in the future.

FFY 2025 Redistribution Supplemental Funding Call Update (Ken Lobeck) Chair Kloster noted the memo in the meeting packet providing information on the FFY 2025 Redistribution Supplemental Funding Call Update. Ken Lobeck can be contacted for further information.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Step 2 – Summary of Applications Received and Revised Schedule (Grace Cho) It was reported the Step 2 application period closed November 22 with a total of 24 applications received. They have requested about \$139 million worth of Regional Flexible Funds. Based off the outcome of our conversation around Step 1A.1, the requested amount could be anywhere between about 2.3 to 3 times the typical amount available. This is somewhat consistent with what we've seen in the past in terms of Step 2 requests of RFFA funds relative to funding available. In total those projects would sum out to about nearly \$200 million. That summary is available in your packet as well as the map.

As part of the materials for Step 2 today there's an updated schedule in light of the slight change of moving the application deadline out by a week. We're switching moving what we're calling the refinement period to January. Over the course of the month of December our consultant team conducting the project will be heard. The project delivery risk assessment will be starting January 3 where they'll have some initial comments as well as potential delivery risks identified as part of the application. Applicants will have a 2-week window to be able to try and address if choosing to do so. These were the key points I wanted you to be aware of for the Step 2 process.

Mike McCarthy relayed a comment heard from the coordinating committee that the 2-week turn around time is very quick and request for more time there. Ms. Cho noted our timeline is still trying to meet a deadline of our March public comment opening. I recognize it's a tight timeline, but we are trying to be as prepared as possible bring forward those comments and questions. Again, I want to specifically note that these are going to be comments directly related to the project delivery risk assessment. This is not an opening for the redoing of the entire application, but it will be relevant to sections in terms of understanding certain delivery considerations.

Oregon Department of Transportation Update on Funding Allocations for 2028-30 (Chris Ford) It was noted there have been a few requests throughout the last few months for an update. Typically, in the course of the process we have more updates by this point. But as you know, we have a smaller budget that we're working with than in prior years. It takes a couple of years prep beforehand to work on the STIPs which happen across four federal fiscal years. There's always a kind of carryover or shared year. So, we're looking at the 2027-30 STIP. And the MTIP covers those projects within the Metropolitan Planning Area.

Typically what's required by Federal Highways is that all the projects that will be in the STIP go through a scoping process, where we do investigations into all the various planning and technical issues that may surround a project, whether it's a signal replacement or a sidewalk infill or paving, to determine the environmental effects, the costs, the mitigations, largely trying to define the project scope, it's location and the cost. Historically, ODOT has prepared roughly a 150% list of projects and then has shared that out for input and review.

However, this time around due to limited capital budgets as well as a limited scoping budget we have been directed to simply develop a draft 100% list without a lot of additional projects simply because there's not the money around to scope a wider range of projects. Many of the projects being scoped are ones that were looked at or considered for the 2024-27 STIP which is the current

one, as well as some scoping work that was cut from projects in the current STIP or the prior one where the scopes had to be reduced in order to handle cost escalation. Many of you project delivery agencies have gone through exactly the same sort of process.

How do we determine exactly which projects. There are different categories, many you are familiar with, and these are developed and assigned by the OTC, largely along the lines of what's called Fix-It. Preservation projects are often paving, operations and culverts. Safety programs are largely handled through arts. At time other categories like enhanced which adds to the State Highway System. There is no enhanced category this time. It's funded at zero so there won't be any of those.

Some of these programs get allocated out at a regional level, and many of them are statewide in which regions develop projects, which are the best projects. The ones that have the best cost benefit analysis are selected at a statewide level. Everything is data driven. Ultimately, given our funding situation, we are looking for those facilities that are in the most either disrepair or in the most need, or which have the worst safety scores. Those get rated first.

There isn't a political discussion around which bridges to invest in and say what the bridges ratings are. What are the available funds. What would be the most effective use of funds in order to repair the bridges in the worst shape. At another time I could give a more thorough presentation on that. At this time, what we're looking at is a pretty small number of projects in the 2027-30 STIP. There's a small number of projects like a local bridge project, landslide project, design planning on others. But no money for paving in the state at this time.

We are looking at 20 arts projects in Region 1. Twelve of those are local arts projects for about \$42.5 million dollars. We're looking at four operation projects with \$18.6 million allocated to the region to cover those. The proposal with the program for Complete Streets 2.0 to OTC was for \$70 million of unallocated funds that would leverage either ADA ramps or a safety project. After internal discussion we've been asked to look to develop two proposals that would cost up to \$25 million. That will still be under discussion around what is possible and what can be funded and whether or not those funds would go to the Great Streets Program.

One of the things that we're discovering as we're going through the scoping process is that the actual cost of delivering and constructing projects is higher than our original business cases had hoped for. As a result, the actual number of projects that would end up being funded in the 27-30 STIP is lower than the numbers that I've just suggested simply because of the cost of projects. We've seen this around the state.

At this point we're not in a spot to say we know how many projects, the total cost of projects, or nor do we have a set 100% or draft 100% list. What we are looking to do is have that pretty much set by next summer. We started much later than in past cycles basically because of the lack of scoping funding as well as the lack of capital funds and the number of reduced programs. Typically, Region 1 shares information for public input earlier than other regions. The actual OTC timeframe for public review starts in January of 2026. Again, Region 1 typically operates a good six months or so ahead of that schedule. Hopefully that is some useful information at this time.

Eric Hesse noted that in terms of those operational improvement projects it doesn't sound like any of those would include that sort of next iteration of the congestion bottleneck operation (CBO) study project concepts. Is that anything you're aware of? Mr. Ford noted I don't believe so at this

time. We did have this as an operation project, actually an investment in intelligent transportation systems as well as variable speed signs on I-5 in Southwest Portland. We do have a project I think under development now that covers from the Markham Bridge. There is funding for a separate project to do more signage from Capital Highway out to 217 heading into Washington. The construction funds in that were reallocated to the 217 project. So that project has design money but it doesn't have any construction money. That isn't a current STIP for design, but we would like there to be a path to construction money in order to advance that. That is one of the CBO projects. Other CBO projects are things like aux lanes or changes to interchanges or acceleration lanes.

Comprehensive Climate Action Plan online open house (Eliot Rose) Mr. Rose reminded the committee of the Comprehensive Climate Action Plan online open house, which is part of our EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant, now open. We're working to create a comprehensive climate action plan for the Portland Vancouver metro area that covers all types of greenhouse gas emissions including not just transportation but also emissions from buildings and goods. This open house is a chance for people to tell us in particular what are the actions that we're considering reducing emissions they see as most beneficial to their communities. We're going to use that to help understand which actions have a lot of equity co-benefits and other co-benefits in this plan as we get into picking them out.

You are welcome to participate yourself and share it with members in your community. This is a joint project for the Portland Vancouver metro area, so we ask Clark and Skamania Counties to help circulate this opportunity. Laurie Lebowsky-Young asked if you have involved Clark County in this process. They are also working on a climate action plan for their comprehensive plan update. Mr. Rose noted Clark County and the City of Vancouver presented at our technical steering group last month. It inspired a lot of great conversation, and we work with them a lot. The link to the online open house was shared: <https://form.jotform.com/jlainvolve/metro-cprg-oooh>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from November 1, 2024

Chair Kloster called the question on the minutes from November 1, 2024 meeting.

Motion passed with no objections or edits, and five abstentions: Adam Fiss, Gerik Kransky, Tara O'Brien, Will Farley, Sarah Iannarone.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 25-5448 Recommendation to JPACT Action Item (Ken Lobeck, Metro) The December 2025 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment was presented. The amendment contains a total of eleven projects.

The amendment includes new discretionary grant awards from the following funding programs:

- Adding three new projects with discretionary awards from the USDOT Safe Streets For All (SS4A) program.
- Adding two new projects with awarded funding from the USDOT Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (CFI) program.
- Adding two new ODOT Public Transportation Division (PTD) awarded funded project for TriMet supporting FTA Section 5310 elderly and disabled persons transit needs.
- Adding one Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2024 Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS) awards for Oregon City to modernize and upgrade safer access to community and retail centers by constructing center turn

lane, pedestrian level street lighting, sidewalks and planter/stormwater treatment area plus Installation of RRFB at a high-volume pedestrian crossing area /

- Adding a new Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/Transportation Systems Management Systems and Operations (TSMO) discretionary awarded for TriMet from the FHWA Advanced Transportation Technology and Innovation (ATTAIN) program.
- Adding the remaining \$5 million of Metro approved Carbon funds to support the ongoing Tualatin Valley Hwy Transit & Development Project.
- Completing a required funding correction to a previously awarded ODOT PTD project supporting FTA section 5310 elderly and disabled persons which increases the authorized funding to TriMet to \$3,674,037 for FFY 2025.

Comments from the committee:

Eric Hesse noted for the benefit of the group and the record that we could still take action for an advance recommendation to JPACT, and that I think the intention would be to have that all settled before JPACT took the formal action in terms of what then would be going to Federal Highway. Just to make sure everyone understands how we're processing this. Mr. Lobeck noted the changes that might occur are very minor. We're not changing the project. We're just tweaking maybe the description for FHWA and the agreement or the name. It's very minor.

MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT to complete all required MTIP programming actions for the eleven projects in the December FFY 2025 MTIP Formal Amendment under resolution 25-5448.

Moved to approve: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Chris Ford

ACTION: Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Candidate Project Evaluation Results (Noel Mickelberry and Grace Cho, Metro) The performance evaluation & project delivery assessment results for the candidate projects in consideration for the 2028-2030 Step 1A.1 new project bond was presented. After a project nomination period was held a total of nine bond nominations moved forward to undergo the candidate project evaluation. The candidate project consists of three separate evaluations which assesses 1) the consistency towards the bond purpose and principles; 2) the performance towards Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) outcomes; and 3) project delivery risks outstanding.

Metro staff conducted the first two evaluations and utilized an external firm to conduct a project delivery assessment. The candidate project evaluation was conducted from late October through November 2024. Specifically in the bond purpose and principles consistency evaluation, the results reflect assumptions pertaining to funding programs and leverage opportunities based on historic precedence of federal surface transportation programs. As new information emerges through the development process, the aim is to incorporate it into the bond development considerations.

A summary of the results across the three components of the evaluation framework as well as the categories the projects was nominated were presented. The project profiles link for more information was provided: https://oregonmetro-my.sharepoint.com/:b/g/personal/grace_cho_oregonmetro_gov1/EcVZFe9ZjTpDk1IR_XERDxABe29JgLFZuaaYbsHSWhYjsw?e=Ea7Ui7

Draft findings from the evaluation were presented. Based on the draft fundings, some nominations tended to perform better than others, but also maintain project delivery matters in need of

resolution. Further information – in particular the financial analysis of the bond scenarios – are expected to roll out in the following months to continue to inform the discussion.

Comments from the committee:

Eric Hesse noted appreciation for an opportunity to follow up with you next week to make sure that we are all on the same page around how some of those were applied and make sure that we're interpreting information provided. Similarly, I've had the Montgomery Park team take a review, and I think they have a few questions they'd like to discuss to make sure they're understanding, particularly around the project delivery.

I have some questions regarding the equity focus area approach since I see differential ratings there in the criteria application. I was imagining that it could be binary based on how I understand the EFAs have been defined, the equity focus areas through the RTP. But it might be only the overlapping of three areas that count contributing to the differential review of that. Ms. Mickelberry and Ms. Cho will follow up on this matter.

Karen Buehrig noted some scales in shades of blue were sometimes hard to read to differentiate one from the next. Clackamas County had some questions. Once you apply scores you get to see how things play out, but then there ends up being questions about how scores are applied. We do look forward to talking more about the background to all of the different blues.

I want to highlight one particular item that was striking to me. It had to do with the rating around something being a regional project or not. That was a striking element for the Sunrise project which has been a project overall in the region for over 40 years as being something that's been extremely important. To have it such a low regional score is interesting.

I also noted that it appeared to be influenced by whether or not there was existing high capacity or frequent transit noted in the comments, but I don't think within that scoring category if was laid out that way. Those are the kind of examples of detail that we want to talk about and how they way something was scored may influence things.

I also think it is interesting using the same scoring system across all different candidate project types, the CIG category, the DSP category, and the access to transit was very difficult because they're very different projects. You can see that the CIG projects scored better overall than the other. It then becomes more difficult to differentiate than the other projects between themselves.

I also thought it was interesting about another note about other funding sources available. It will be helpful to get feedback about exactly what other funding sources would be available for these projects that would have influenced the scoring. Because as a jurisdiction that has applied for a project, we're all looking for funding. If there are places where funding is available that would be really exciting for us to hear about.

The last note regarding project delivery on page 154 of the packet, was the project delivery assessment and whether you had a number of mitigations. It looked like our project had a mitigation for construction, even though our project had to do with project development. It caused us to have a higher number of mitigations which I think ended up giving a lower score, but our project wasn't necessarily a construction project. Those are the kind of details we want to understand so that we can strengthen our project as it goes into the next step of the process.

A five-minute break in the meeting was taken.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Bond Scenarios Input and Process Next Steps (Grace Cho, Metro) Regional partners are asked to provide input towards concepts/themes to provide direction to Metro staff in develop bond scenarios for financial assessment. The input will get utilized to shape the next part of the new project bond development process. The input on the bond scenarios concepts and themes is the first of three areas of input to help guide and shape development of the new project bond. The bond scenarios concepts or themes are intended to shape different potential investment packages (also known as scenarios) through a detailed financial assessment which will look at answering critical questions on whether the scenarios can meet the objectives of the bond purpose and principles or even be a feasible or viable option for the region.

The aim is to have a maximum of five bond scenarios taken through the financial assessment to understand the overall commitment and costs for advancing revenues and the financial tradeoffs. Between December 2024 through March 2025, Metro staff will continue to analysis results and information to support the discussion of shaping bond scenarios and ultimately taking action on a preferred bond scenario to carry through public comment.

Comments from the committee:

Eric Hesse noted from the City of Portland’s perspective we appreciate you emphasizing the program direction since TPAC, JPACT and Metro Council spent a fair amount of time earlier in the process defining that, which is the policy direction that we’re trying to implement through this. Continuing to look at how the evaluation you’re conducting along with those other technical and financial consideration you laid out to come together to meet that program direction feels like the strong focus.

I have a little bit of discomfort or uncertainty around how this theme concept lays on top of what is already an adopted policy direction. I’ll note that there seems some potential risk to be adding additional policy direction here once folks see what the project evaluation looks like, which always has a little risk of gaming. I appreciate that there are important conversations to be had around how people interpret how tis evaluation measures speak to the program direction. I’d encourage us to continue to take a look at that and evaluate how well the current evaluation, which we also spent time approving, relates to that. I think we are feeling that maybe some of the themes that focus more on the project or the program direction, and don’t seem to move away from it, would be the area or the directionality that feels most appropriate.

Sarah Paulus noted Multnomah County will also follow up next week to learn more about our evaluation score. I’ll add that talking about the different bonding scenarios and where we go from here, it seems like the evaluation metrics did generally give higher scores to those CIG projects and noted that the question of how we can compare these three categories that are inherently very different from each other. I think we should keep that in mind as we are looking at different scenarios. We had these three different categories in the program direction this entire time. Honoring that as we move forward and finding a way to place value on all three of those will be really important.

Karen Buehrig agreed, we need to be looking at the program direction. JPACT thought deeply about the fact that if we were going to move forward with additional bonding that we wouldn’t necessarily

want to do it just the way we had in the past. That perhaps it shouldn't just be the CIG high-capacity transit projects. There was a full conversation about a variety of different categories. I think that as we think about the themes, the themes should consider that the program direction talks about different categories and how those categories may be appropriate to be funded by these bond revenue funds.

As this point in time, I guess the theme there would be closer to diversification. One was one of the seeded ideas within the materials we were provided. How can we have a theme that is about diversifying these bond revenues into different types of investments and not just one type of investment.

Mike McCarthy noted that it's important that whatever package goes forward is clearly recognized as meeting major regional needs. Which means the majority of people around the region from all over the region would recognize that package as meeting major regional needs. Particularly people who are not involved in these types of discussions. I think going out for bond funding, debt funding is a big deal. I think it's important that it's clear to everybody that the major regional needs are being addressed.

Tara O'Brien noted I'd echo Mr. Hesse's comment that we do have some program direction and do want to understand how layering these themes helps to develop the package more differently. It sounds as though you might be showing us some potential scenarios for packages sometime soon, and that we could weigh in there. I think from TriMet's perspective, going back to the program direction and to what Mr. McCarthy was saying as well, these funds are critical, we're basically borrowing against the future to access more money now. And so how can we make sure these funds are supporting projects that are ready to move forward and begin spending these funds, and that it is more cost effective for us to do that through bonding do it now. I think implementation readiness, maximum leverage as well as emphasized RTP outcomes are some of the themes that might sound best to us related back to that initial program direction.

Dyami Valentine noted these are all good projects and all important to move forward and receive funding at some point. I would also reiterate what Mr. Hesse, Mr. McCarthy and Ms. O'Brien have said, that is we have clear direction with these types of funding programs. It's important that these are regional programs, regional projects. I think the map that was shown was illustrative and evaluation is clearly demonstrated.

There are two critical projects that are important to be funded through this effort. Then there is something else that elevates from a thematic standpoint, maximizing and leveraging other funding that is critical to accomplishing regional RTP goals. It would echo the importance of how this is being communicated and the conversation that we have with the public, which I think is going to be critical as well. And how we're selling the need to take advantage of a bond at this point. The 82nd Avenue and TV Highway projects are critical projects to help advance now sooner than later. It was added another consideration that we will be keenly interested in seeing the scenario development address is the impact on Step 2 funding for this and future rounds.

Grace Cho wanted to clarify where folks seem to be going about how do the themes play in the context of the program direction. The themes are intended to be a way to help us focus. Every scenario that we're going to elevate needs to be able to pass that program direction but essentially has that objective. In an effort to not have an endless number of scenarios that permeates that, we

would look at the desire which is really helpful. I'm hearing some key things so that you for the direction and we continue to be interested in hearing more. How should we focus and build. If we're limited to a small number, how do we want to put some different ideas or investment packages together that we would start to then put that pen to paper and understand what those different effects are. We are asking JPACT for input. But this will probably be the only touch at TPAC that we're specifically gathering input on the concepts and themes once we start bringing scenarios forward. It will be a bit different conversation. Maybe it's more of an adjustment's conversation. But this is helping us understand what you would like to see us evaluate in terms of a scenario.

Sarah Iannarone noted that it takes a lot for different jurisdictions to apply for these projects with uncertainty of whether they'll get them or not. We appreciate everybody applying but there's a couple of things when it comes to regionalism and why we have Metro here, to help us transcend what I call inter-jurisdictional competition. It's one of the things that's amazing about our greater Portland metro, insofar as the work that we put into things like the RTP can help us surmount what in other places could come down to whether or not we have parity across one jurisdiction or another. Because at the end of the day it's the equitable outcomes at the regional level, the climate goals that we've set together at a region that really should be getting our decision making that is the benefit of regionalism and why we come to all these meetings month after month to do what sometimes is painstaking and time-consuming work.

There's another aspect of this conversation that's not been addressed yet, which is the transition in Washington DC. We're headed into four years ahead that have been different from the past four years where we saw an amazing amount of investment in the types of things that we know that our region desires. The landscape ahead is far more rocky and one of the things we should probably do is lean into where we have been strong as a region historically in DC and that might compete with some of the interests of particular jurisdictions. Because what we know has done well for our region in DC have been some of the CIGs, and transit related CIGs at that. Again, it's another variable on top of the work that we did in the RTP and some of the goals that we set there, which may constrain our ability to leverage certain investments that we can make through this bonding process. Those are my comments. Just remembering the power of regionalism that we're one region only in this work and that Washington DC is going to be a different place for the next four years.

Chris Ford appreciated the comments on regionalism. As a professional observation with a background as a land use planner, I like the idea of projects that would inherently support land use development that is related to the 2040 growth concept. I think that's the whole idea in that transportation and land use are always linked. And anything that in particular is meant to advance that is good from an ODOT perspective, and this is mostly meant to potentially help provide themes. We have a relatively new Oregon transportation plan adopted the other month. That doesn't only affect ODOT, it's supposed to guide and influence all of the agencies in the state. The big themes in that are safety, equity and climate that lines up very well with the RTP. One thought is to potentially have a scenario that focuses on each of those, and then maybe one that balances that.

Indi Namkoong noted I've appreciated the comments about regionalism and serving these bigger picture goals of this somewhat if not unique at least uncommon opportunity. I echo what other have said about staying focused on those north stars of what's in our program direction, what do we already know we're trying to achieve with these, as well as what are these central RTP goals that can be advanced in this. I think we have an excellent foundation to be going forward with our evaluation and staying focused on that is a valuable approach here.

Safe Streets for All Update (Lake McTighe, Metro) Since adoption of the 2018 Regional Transportation Safety Strategy, regional partners have continued to work collaboratively towards safer streets. Trends such as larger and faster vehicles, limited funding for decades of backlogged safety projects on urban arterials, lack of affordable housing, and gaps in mental health services, continue to contribute to rising traffic deaths. At the same more communities and agencies are developing Transportation Safety Action Plans (TSAP) to meet these trends with coordinated strategies at the local level.

A series of graphs were shown on causes of fatal crashes. An update on the Safe Streets for All was given. Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project focused on establishing foundational data management processes and data deliverables that can be maintained and carried forward past the life of the grant, developing a communication plan, and finalizing TSAP work plans and agreements with SS4A co-applicants Multnomah County, Washington County and Tigard, and developing data and analysis. Phase 3 of the project will focus on strategies and solutions. Refer to the attached slides for a brief update from Multnomah County and the City of Tigard.

Data and analysis, strategies and solutions, and communications and coordination from Phase 1 and 1 of the projects will lead into Phase 3. Key deliverables were outlined.

Safety trend highlights

- In the last 16 years (2007-2022) the average number of people killed each while walking in the greater Portland region has doubled, and the average number of people killed while riding a motorcycle has doubled.
- The growing number of larger vehicles is likely a contributing factor in the increase in pedestrian deaths and other serious crashes.
- Alcohol, drug and speeding related crashes are increasing.
- The region's traffic fatality rate is half that of Oregon. Washington County has the lowest fatality rate. Lower traffic fatality rates in the region are supported by land use and access to transit contributing to lower vehicle miles traveled per capita.

Effective countermeasures for reducing or eliminating these types of crashes include adding and widening walkways, medians, pedestrian refuge islands, pedestrian scale lighting and crossing visibility, fixed speed safety cameras, pedestrian hybrid beacons, lowering posted speeds, signal timing, and road diets. Using multiple countermeasures is more effective.

Comments from the committee:

Bill Beamer asked about distraction, whether that be from vehicles or pedestrians because I think so much of that impacts what happens, especially if it's dark. I didn't see weather conditions, such as rainy and you have glare coming off the road. These things are pretty typical in our region because of weather, also about the world that we live in, and people focused on devices and other things.

Ms. McTighe noted distraction is not capture very well in the crash data. It's hard to capture in that way. There may be other ways to capture it through vehicle technology and stuff like that but it's often proprietary data, very important. Both of those things, weather and distraction are things that we could look at more systemically if the data is available. Mr. Beamer added a general comment related that, especially when it comes to distraction it's a huge thing for all of us to try to think about and consider because a lot of that is behavior and how we think about things, and what do we do not just in terms of infrastructure but how do we address those things.

Sarah Paulus wanted to thank Ms. McTighe and Metro as we've been working on our safety action plan. We've appreciated your guidance and bringing this to such a regional scale. I think the more we can do with our community engagement as well as data, the better we can be to start implementing some of these countermeasures. Thank you for flagging this for the group and we're excited to keep working on this.

Mike McCarthy thought that fatalities by year plot was striking. Particularly if we extended a way back, we've had declining fatalities rates for several decades up until about 2010 to 2015 period. And then the increase has just been striking. To have it double in the last decade is crazy. And this year will be more than double 10 years ago because we're at 114 already with three of the most dangerous weeks of the year left.

I think we need to take a serious look at what we're doing transportation planning wise to see what's going on. I appreciate the look at some of the other factors. I hear its people getting drunk and high, but people have been getting drunk and high for decades. People have been distracted for decades, maybe more now with smartphones, but 20 years ago they were still talking on cell phones, eating, putting on makeup, arguing with the kids or whatever, all while driving. So, I think we can't just blame it on driver factors.

We need to look at what's going on with our transportation network. I want to look at factors like how congestion on the freeway is causing more people to divert onto these arterials and then get into some of these crashes. How is congestion on the arterials causing more people driving through less suitable roads with higher crash rates. I think there's a lot of factors we need to look at, but I think we can't just blame the drivers for it. I think we have to really look at what we're doing systemwide. And despite all the great effort by all the people for the past decade on Zero One plans, why has it doubled since then? Ms. McTighe added just a note on behavior, our focus with the safe system, is that even when people make mistakes they do not result in death.

Will Farley noted one factor that popped into my head, kind of covered by demographics, but the proximity between where the incident happened and someone's home. I know you can't get trip destination, but I feel they always say that the crashes happened within one mile of their home. We can start looking if that truly is lining up, or if people making long year trips or unfamiliar with an area is causing an incident or not expecting a pedestrian walking across the street or walking further from home. Just an interesting thought to see that broken into the data.

Eric Hesse noted I do believe the Vison Eval analysis has good data on at least state level fleet composition (the light trucks issue Lake noted). Might also have regional values. Ms. McTighe agreed, and the FARS data has vehicle type too. we are looking into how we might take a closer look at that.

Overview of the expanded Metropolitan Planning Area in North Marion County (Abigail Smith and Max Johnson, Metro) The presentation provided a better understanding of the new addition to Metro's transportation planning area in North Marion County. The Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) outlines the boundary for regional transportation planning. The MPA is based on contiguous urbanized areas with criteria for urban determined by the U.S. Census Bureau and are updated every 10 years (every census).

Historically, Metro's MPA hasn't changed much but in 2020, one irregular, paved block triggered a

"kite-tail" shape into Marion County that included the Aurora State Airport, City of Aurora and City of Hubbard. The addition closely follows impervious surfaces that begins in Clackamas County near Wilsonville and ends in Marion County at Hubbard. The transportation overview, cultural history, and demographic overview of the area was provided.

The economy of the area was presented, noting at least 40% of residents commute to the Metro region for work. Current transportation projects in the area include the Boone Bridge on I-5 (2023-2030) seismic retrofitting project, Aurora State Airport (Ongoing) Master Plan update, Aurora-Donald I-5 Interchange (2024-2027) Phase 2 of interchange expansion, and OR 99E Highway Pavement project (2024-2025).

Next steps with this area to note is North Marion County is growing, especially with major transportation projects at Boone Bridge & the Aurora Donald Interchange along I-5. This area has a unique economic and cultural landscape that ties it to Marion County and the Willamette Valley. Metro will work with regional partners to integrate the kite tail into our regional planning work in the coming year.

As the next Census approaches, Metro should consider:

- o Commenting on the Federal Register to correct 2020 Census inconsistencies
- o Monitoring future MPA boundaries for unexpected changes
- o Supporting Aurora & Hubbard to move to a more representative planning area
 - A possible future Woodburn MPA
 - 2030 population projected at 37,000, close to 50,000

Comments from the committee:

Karen Buehrig noted as a representative of Clackamas County this is something that we have been engaged at some level in the conversation and it does make a difference. One thing that may be helpful, because there is this sort of conflict between the federal guidance that we have and what we're doing to follow federal guidance versus Metro rules, regulations and even State. This is really about federal guidance and implementing that federal guidance. One piece of information that I think is helpful is the fact that these areas or at least the area in Clackamas County down there is actually in rural reserves. The census might designate these places as urban but as a region we have designated them as rural. And to remind people of that because it appears as if there's some sort of urban creep that goes on, but really there's these things that we've been doing at the regional level to identify those places as rural.

I look forward to future conversations about the actual implications of being in the MPA. In this presentation we were talking about how these areas are in the MPA but what does that mean. Does that mean if these jurisdictions have projects that are federally funded, they then go into our MTIP? Does it mean that now that they're designated as urban spaces that they have to follow federal urban design guidelines? I think those are the things that would be helpful for people to understand.

Mike McCarthy noted I think it raises a lot of questions like the ones Ms. Buehrig asked about how this affects and how things work. One of the things I noticed it said more than 40% of the people commute into the metro area for work. I've been seeing a lot of that pattern as well. I also want to note that a lot of the contractors that we work with are based in this area. So even though those commutes might be listed as a commute to the contractor's office, in reality they're actually going to work somewhere in the metro region. I'm hoping this opens the door for more transit, particularly

connecting to this area to help some of the people who were otherwise driving into the metro area to be able to ride a bus, for example. Having worked for Marion County years back, just hearing a lot of anti-urban sentiment from people in this area. I would advise being careful about how those conversations go and how things are presented.

Eric Hesse noted I've heard you focus mostly on the planning aspect, but I think I've heard that there may also be implications for formula funds and what might be coming through to the urban area and things like that. Are able to give a brief preview as to whether there are any potential funding implications as well that you're processing. Or is it really the planning process?

Chair Kloster noted in terms of how great this might be for them and landing grants that come through the Metro streams will reflect a small population. My focus has been on how we represent the area and that we include it when we do analysis for the purpose of our plan. Ted Leybold added that if they are going to nominate projects, they would be eligible for funding. It would be no different than anybody else in the region in terms of having to apply for it through the RTP process if they did that.

Adjournment

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:01 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, December 6, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	12/6/2024	12/6/2024 TPAC Agenda	120624T-01
2	2025 TPAC Work Program	11/22/2024	2025 TPAC Work Program as of 11/22/2024	120624T-02
3	Memo	11/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments: December 2024 Report	120624T-03
4	Memo	11/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: FFY 2025 Redistribution Supplemental Funding Call Update	120624T-04
5	Memo	11/27/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 – Summary of Applications Received	120624T-05
6	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund - Step 2 - Applications Received	120624T-06
7	Attachment 2	N/A	Attachment 2. Regional Flexible Funds Allocation 2028-30 Step 2 Application Map	120624T-07
8	Memo	11/27/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 Next Steps - Updated	120624T-08
9	Draft Minutes	11/1/2024	Draft minutes from TPAC November 1, 2024 meeting	120624T-09
10	Resolution 25-5448	N/A	Resolution 25-5448 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING OR AMENDING A TOTAL OF ELEVEN PROJECTS TO THE 2024-27 MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	120624T-10
11	Exhibit A to Resolution 25-5448	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 25-5448	120624T-11
12	Staff Report to Resolution 25-5448	11/26/2024	Staff Report to Resolution 25-5448	120624T-12

13	Attachment 1	Fall 2024	Attachment 1: Key 23623 – TV Hwy Safety and Transit Project Flyer	120624T-13
14	Memo	12/3/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 1A.1 – Bond Evaluation Results	120624T-14
15	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1 – Individual Candidate Project Evaluations – Summary of Main Comments	120624T-15
16	Memo	12/2/2024	TO: Metro Staff: Grace Cho, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickleberry, Dan Kaempff, and Ted Leybold From: Nicholas Meltzer, Lekshmy Hirandas, and Camilla Dartnell, PE, Kittelson & Associates RE: 2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 Project Delivery Assessment	120624T-16
17	Memo	12/3/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 (New Project Bond) – Bond Scenarios Concepts Input and Next Steps	120624T-17
18	Memo	11/25/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Lake McTighe, Principal Planner RE: Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Update	120624T-18
19	Presentation	12/6/2024	Safe Streets for All: Transportation safety update to TPAC	120624T-19
20	Presentation	12/6/2024	Metropolitan Planning Area Expansion in North Marion County	120624T-20
21	Presentation	12/6/2024	Fatal Crash Update	120624T-21
22	Presentation	12/6/2024	Transit Minute Report	120624T-22
23	Presentation	12/6/2024	December FFY 2025 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 25-5448	120624T-23
24	Presentation	12/6/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Step 1A.1 Candidate Project Performance Evaluation & Project Delivery Assessment Results	120624T-24
25	Presentation	12/6/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Bond Concepts Input & Next Steps	120624T-24