



# Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, February 1, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

---

## **Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Joanna Valencia  
Chris Deffebach  
Dayna Webb  
Katherine Kelly  
Don Odermott  
Jeff Owen  
Phil Healy  
Jennifer Campos  
Tyler Bullen  
Maria Hernandez-Segoviano  
Emily Lai  
Beverly Drottar

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
TriMet  
Port of Portland  
City of Vancouver  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative  
Community Representative

## **Alternates Attending**

Eric Hesse  
Jaimie Huff  
Todd Juhasz  
Jon Makler  
Lidwien Rahman  
Jason Gibbens

## **Affiliate**

City of Portland  
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Beaverton and Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Transportation (newly retired)  
Washington State Department of Transportation

## **Members Excused**

Lynda David  
Mark Lear  
Mandy Putney  
Cory Ann Wind  
Rachael Tupica  
Glenn Koehrsen  
Jessica Stetson

## **Affiliate**

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Portland  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Federal Highway Administration  
Community Representative  
Community Representative

## **Guests Attending**

Kari Schlosshauer  
Garet Prior

## **Affiliate**

Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership  
City of Tualatin

## **Metro Staff Attending**

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner      Daniel Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner

Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead  
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner  
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner  
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner  
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

John Mermin, Senior Regional Planner  
Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner  
Jamie Snook, Principal Transportation Planner  
Cindy Pederson, Manager I, Research Center

## 1. Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chairman Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. A quorum was called and introductions were made.

## 2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Retirement Celebration for Lidwien Rahman**

Members of TPAC and staff provided memories and stories of working with Ms. Rahman over the years. Her contributions to the regions' transportation planning and mentorship with staff in and outside ODOT were acknowledged. With this retirement, Ms. Rahman will continue to work on the Mobility Policy Update and stay involved in limited time with transportation issues. TPAC congratulates and acknowledges Ms. Rahman for her many professional and personal years of insight and efforts.

- **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Process Update** (John Mermin)

Mr. Mermin announced the draft UPWP was electronically sent to federal, state and jurisdictional partners, including TPAC members, a week ago. Reviews are asked of TPAC with comments given to Mr. Mermin. TPAC will again be reviewing the document at the March 1 meeting, followed by the March 6 federal and state consultation review at Metro which TPAC members are invited to attend. Final review and recommendation to JPACT will be made at the April 5 TPAC meeting.

- **2021-2024 STIP Fix-It Leverage Recommendations** (Jon Makler)

Mr. Makler announced that project scoping have concluded for every project that began nine months ago. Inflation and contingency factors have increased considerations with project budgets, which managers are working through now with estimates. The availability of funds constrained by possible leveraging for projects is now being addressed, based on the key policy direction provided by TPAC, JPACT and ACT. Mr. Makler estimated that by the March 1 TPAC meeting there would be more information to share on the first cut of projects from the 100% list. Developments are being discussed currently.

ODOT is planning to involve stakeholders in earlier comment periods, rather than spring 2020. This will provide clarity on regional decisions with a higher level of transparency, with opportunity for input that is more relevant in the process. Region 1 has \$26-27 million dedicated to safety, active transportation and highway projects, acknowledging that comments and input for these decisions from stakeholders is best placed when most relevant.

- **February 20 Equity Workshop Announcement**

Chair Kloster announced an Equity Strategy workshop placed on the calendar Feb. 20 for TPAC members. Dr. Alison Allen-Hall has been contacted to be the facilitator. A page of her bio was provided as a handout. This would be the first of a series on racial equity training for TPAC planned this year. More details are being planned for schedules with member availability to

attend workshops, with further opportunities provided to TPAC on the planning and development department's equity strategies currently being rolled out for implementation. Thoughts on the workshops can be provided to Chair Kloster.

NOTE: This workshop was later delayed until a further date, and replaced with a Special TPAC workshop meeting on RFFA for Feb. 20. See agenda item #8.

- **Quarterly MTIP Summary Report and Semi-Annual UPWP Progress Report** (Ken Lobeck)

Mr. Lobeck provided information on the 2018 Semi-annual UPWP Summary Report, and MTIP 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter FFY 2019 of progress report on completed amendments. FHWA reviews these reports and provides feedback on funding and priorities. Due to the number of amendments, reporting monthly with new streamlined format provides better transparency, and ability to show trends and issues that account for changed project schedules and adjustments of cost methodology. These reports are listed in the memo with the meeting packet.

- **Project Reviews for Obligation Status Updates** (Ken Lobeck)

Mr. Lobeck provided the preliminary results of a Federal Fiscal year (FFY) 2019 status review for obligation purposes of Metro funded Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Program/Surface Transportation Block Grant (STP/STBG), and Transportation Alternatives/Transportation Alternatives Program (TA/TAP) projects.

This is a new system being developed to report progress allowing the awarded agencies the ability to obligate the federal funds throughout the year. This first project monitoring review establishes the programming accuracy for FFY 2019 and helps confirm if all \$56 million in programmed projects will be needed. The review also identifies the current status of projects as they progress through the federal transportation project delivery process.

Mr. Lobeck reviewed the color coding of flagged projects with projects reviewed on status updates that indicated seven STBG fund projects will need to slip to 2020 which totals \$4.3 million. These are the red flags. The yellow flags in the table of projects indicate a no slip or ones to watch for changes. Mr. Lobeck reported that if we obligate at least 80% of funded projects each year, we are doing well. If we fall under this percentage we would need to look at options in trades or shifts in projects. A follow-up review will occur during May-June 2019 to determine how the projects are progressing. The early review and needed project phase slips allow Metro and ODOT to complete several programming and obligation compliance requirements. For more details on the project status codes listed on page 5 of the memo, or more information on progress status updates, members are encouraged to contact Mr. Lobeck.

### 3. **Public Communications on Agenda Items** - none

### 4. **Consideration of TPAC Minutes from January 11, 2019**

**MOTION: To approve the minutes from January 11, 2019 as presented.**

Moved: Don Odermott

Seconded: Eric Hesse

**ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.**

**5. MTIP Formal Amendment Resolution 19-4965**

Ken Lobeck presented the February 2019 Formal MTIP Amendment and Approval Request of Resolution 19-4965, which contains required changes and updates impacting TriMet. Two projects comprise the amendment bundle. The amendment is increasing TriMet’s Community Job Connector’s project by transferring 5307 and required match from their preventative maintenance project.

ODOT Key #	MTIP ID #	Lead Agency Name	Project	Project Description	Description of Changes
19712	70857	TriMet	Community Job Connector Shuttle 2018	<del>Implement a new job connector shuttle north and south of Hwy 26 supporting low and middle wage workers transit needs within the North Hillsboro Industrial District</del> Replace with --> <b>Improved access to jobs and job-related activities for the low-income workforce and to transport residents of urbanized and non-urbanized areas to suburban employment opportunities.</b>	<b>COST INCREASE:</b> An additional \$417,088 of federal FTA Section 5307 funds (along with local matching funds) are being added to the project to implement planned services during FFY 2019. The cost increase represents a 33.6% change to the project and is above the FTA threshold for cost changes via administrative modifications. The added federal 5307 is being transferred from TriMet’s Preventative Maintenance project in Key 19334. The project’s description is updated to be consistent with the standardized description in place for the annual job connector projects
19334	70737	TriMet	Capital Maintenance For Bus And Rail	Capital Maintenance For Bus And Rail	<b>FUNDS TRANSFER:</b> \$417,088 of federal; FTA Section 5307 funds and associated local matching funds are being transferred to Key 19712, TriMet’s Community Job Connector Shuttle project to increase its authorized funding level.

Mr. Lobeck reminded the committee that a key part of the formal amendment process includes the public notification process which involves ensuring the public has an opportunity to comment on the proposed changes. Metro posts the amendment on the MTIP website for 30 days and collects any and all public comments submitted via email. Public comments also occurs through Metro approval committees, including TPAC. This public comment period is federally required, allowing the formal amendment process to proceed to JPACK as a consent item.

Comments from the committee:

- Emily Lai asked where links were located for the community job connector projects, and what might be available for the public to review with the budget breakdown on these projects. The links to the projects are located on the Metro website:  
<http://www.oregonmetro.gov/metropolitan-transportation-improvement-program>  
Budget breakdowns on these projects with TriMet will be provided by Jeff Owen following the meeting.

**MOTION:** To approve recommendation of Resolution 19-4965 to JPACK which includes 2 project impacting TriMet, and direct staff to make all necessary corrections to materials as needed.

Moved: Chris Deffebach

Seconded: Karen Buehrig

**ACTION:** Motion passed unanimously

**6. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Policy Update Resolution 19-4963**

Grace Cho provided an overview on the revisions to the 2021-24 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) policy direction since the January 11, 2019 TPAC meeting. Referencing Table 1. Feedback received at TPAC and Metro responses, memo dated Jan. 25, 2019 in the packet:

TPAC Feedback Received	Metro Staff Response
Break MTIP policy 3 into two separate policies: one for the regional finance approach and one for the regional coordination of funding opportunities	Revised the 2021-2024 MTIP policy to split up policy 3 into policy 3 and 4.
Further clarify that the MTIP policies proposed are a continuation of previously adopted MTIP policies, but with updates and adjustments	Revised introduction of the desired outcome section of the 2021-2024 MTIP policy report to provide clarification.
Further clarify the RTP has been implicit guiding policy direction, but with the 2021-2024 MTIP, the most recently adopted RTP is being identified more explicitly.	Revised policy 1 to make this clarification
Highlight the priority outcomes to emerge out of the 2018 RTP to make further progress in the near-term.	Revised language in policy 1 to highlight the priority outcomes.
Desire to see a more comprehensive understanding of the revenue sources composition contributing to the overall amount of transportation funding available	This request is complex and beyond the scope of the regional finance approach. Chapter 5 and the appendices of the 2018 RTP can provide a breakdown of revenues and composition of forecasted funds.
Desire to see what impacts MTIP amendments have to the overall progress of implementation of the RTP and the direction of the adopted MTIP	This is an item which is being scoped as part of Metro’s obligations and requirements to comply with federal performance-based programming as part of the 2021-2024 MTIP. As further information and a scope of work is developed, this item will return to TPAC.

Ms. Cho reviewed the four 2021-2024 MTIP policies:

- The 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the foundation and guide for transportation projects and programs included in the 2021-2024 MTIP. Transportation projects and programs are expected to align investments to achieve the outcomes of the RTP policy priorities: safety, equity, addressing climate change, and managing congestion.
- Comply with all federal regulations and requirements (programmatically and by project).
- Pursue the region’s finance approach.
- Coordinate openly on fund leverage opportunities between regional allocation processes (e.g. Regional Flexible Fund and Fix-It Leverage) and competitive national discretionary grant opportunities (e.g. New Starts, Infrastructure for Rebuilding America).

After providing the projected MTIP Work Plan Timeline and Next Steps, Ms. Cho asked for questions and asked the committee for recommendation to JPACT.

Comments from the committee:

- Jon Makler commented in agreement with the MTIP policy, but requested clarity on tying RTP priorities listed in Policy 1. Noting that MTIP is broader than simply RFFA projects, and that different criteria for funding allocations and requirements exist for seeking eligibility for federal funding, it was challenging to answer how these policies would be used in a meaningful method and direction, specifically when directed with policy in the RTP and advancing the priorities named.

Ms. Cho responded her interpretation would be the MTIP describes how the four agencies in the region which receive federal funding are prioritizing transportation projects in a manner that is consistent with the RTP and federal requirements. The RTP gave direction to emphasis four policy priorities in the region's transportation investments to make progress in the near term; safety, equity, mitigating climate change, and managing congestion. Mr. Makler agreed, but would add that in the recommendation to JPACT, this be affirmed more clearly and then go further to advocate advancement to these policy issues.

- Karen Buehrig commented on the language of the priorities that were contained within the adopted the RTP. Also within the RTP and Table Six were seven key recommendations and refinements to the project list. These list of priorities included travel options, climate smart technology and congestion in general. It was recommended that the language of MTIP Policy 1 should point to the RTP and Table Six as near term regional priorities.

It was appreciated that separating the MTIP from RFFA as two different documents would provide better clarity. In order to continue this direction, it was recommended to remove the footnotes (listed as 3 & 4) on page 13 of the Policy Direction draft, with the reasons to remove them as they relate directly to RFFA and the funds named in the footnotes could be used for RFFA purposes.

- Katherine Kelly asked for consideration of continuing this conversation at the policy level with MTIP but not closing it with the recommendation to JPACT on the resolution until the following RFFA agenda item is discussed. RFFA is part of policy 3 in the MTIP Policy Direction draft, Table 1, included in the Regional Finance Approach, and needs discussion further.

Chair Kloster provided background on past policy direction to not use RFFA funds on road projects. Ms. Cho noted the footnotes explain how funds are currently being used. If there is a desire to change the course of how certain existing funds are used to investment in the transportation system, then calling them out with any recommendations might be needed. Ms. Kelly agreed keeping the policy general and flexible for project level direction but providing clarity for RFFA priorities in pursuing sources for funding.

- Emily Lai asked for clarification on the description of the policy, and whether this was intended to show current policy or new direction. Ms. Cho responded that what is presented in the policy is the current policy, but with updates to have taken place since 2016. She clarified the ultimate direction is to continue with the current policy listed, but with updates.
- Chris Deffebach commented on separating the MTIP from RFFA to make each more understandable. Ms. Deffebach felt the footnotes in this discussion belonged in the RFFA policy, not the MTIP policy. The four policies listed in the MTIP direction were too narrow in

scope for the whole region and would be better kept as a broader policy to leverage funding when possible. There are more projects that need funding that go beyond these priorities listed.

- Jon Makler pointed out that projects listed in the MTIP must be consistent with the RTP, as should the policies with the programs. Priorities in the MTIP with project considerations do not exclude what is included in the RTP. Ms. Cho added that project could have multiple objectives, with the intent in priorities to address issues such as equity safety may be an indirect or additional objective reached from the project, not necessarily the main priority.
- Maria Hernandez-Segoviano asked for more clarity to be reflected between the RTP and MTIP priorities that appeared possible to be interpreted in different ways. Rather than summarized, more of the policies need to be defined and called out to ensure clear public perception.
- Emily Lai agreed with holding the RFFA discussion first before completing the MTIP conversation. It was felt how funding allocations tied to policy priorities are still not detailed enough in which to determine as final agreement. The importance for the region with project funding and the accountability with these investment decisions may need more discussion.
- Joanna Valencia added to Ms. Lai's comments on the importance of calling out priorities and defining further with policy before adopting the MTIP policy direction. The RFFA discussion will help clarify issues with funding priorities. It was suggested that the finance methodology approach be eliminated from the policy document.
- Ms. Cho agreed that language updated with the MTIP policy coming from the RFFA discussion would help clarify. It was possible that RFFA may contain its own funding methodology table with significant changes to policy. Chair Kloster added that significant changes proposed to the MTIP policy if agreed by TPAC should be spelled out clearly when recommended to JPACT. There may be different steps between MTIP to RFFA which need to be defined. Chair Kloster suggested switching RFFA workshop for Equity Workshop on Feb. 20. Arrangements will be discussed on this and provided to TPAC soon.

**MOTION: To remove policy #3 from the 2021-2024 MTIP Policy as presented, and keep policies 1,2 and 4. Policy #3 would be referred to the RFFA discussion.**

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Seconded: Tyler Bullen

Discussion on the motion:

- Tyler Bullen commented on not fully understanding how moving policy #3 into the RFFA discussion might allow highway expansion project funding to use RFFA designated funds. If so, there should be further discussion on this. The other three policies make sense, but policy #3 needs clarification.
- Emily Lai asked for the definition of the funding mechanisms with MTIP and relation to RFFA, and why this has importance with policy #3. Jon Makler explained the MTIP as our federal funding in the region, with RFFA a small part of this funding with specific objectives needing to be determined by priorities. Chris Deffebach added that there was some state funding included in these priority projects also, which made it hard to sort out through MTIP alone. Possible legislative changes can affect our policy direction and asked if we are planning federal funding for projects, or forecasting for potential changes to funding with changes to priorities.
- Emily Lai asked what the significance was for policies if removed from funding priorities. It was acknowledged that RFFA was a sensitive issue and cautioned that taking away the funding policy mechanism without discussion might be ill-advised. More discussion on the table is needed. Highway and road expansion is a concern without designated bus stop lanes could be

included in the plans. If an amendment might be considered with the policy recommendation, adding additional funding sources and strategies from corporate taxes and car/other industries, and bond measures for transportation planning might increase these traditional funding sources.

- Grace Cho added that the policy finance approach came from an agreement in 2009 from the JPACT finance subcommittee that, at that time, looked at sources of funds prioritized for specific uses. Each cycle since has adopted and used this funding approach. Chair Kloster added that the current roadmap for regional investments affects our next steps for the RFFA framework.

Katherine Kelly retracted the following motion:

**MOTION: To remove policy #3 from the 2021-2024 MTIP Policy as presented, and keep policies 1,2 and 4. Policy #3 would be referred to the RFFA discussion.**

- Not as a motion at this time, but for further discussion consideration, Ms. Kelly agreed with the text of Policy 3 but without fully understanding the table and feeling it incomplete, have this removed, and further consider the addition of Ms. Lai's proposed amendment (*If an amendment might be considered with the policy recommendation, adding additional funding sources and strategies from corporate taxes and car/other industries, and bond measures for transportation planning might increase these traditional funding sources.*)
- Karen Buehrig commented that she had challenges understanding the table which seemed to cause issues for clarity. Ms. Buehrig recommended putting the two footnotes listed in the Regional Finance Approach table be described fully in text at the beginning of the table, as they are important and hold significant relevance to funding. Chair Kloster agreed the table could be better explained in the report.

Another recommendation to the policy report was on page 9, second sentence, "As the policy direction for investments, regional partners agree to implement the policy priorities to emerge from the 2018 RTP *insert (as identified in table 6.1 of the RTP) – equity, safety, addressing climate change, and congestion management.* More discussion can follow that provides more direction related to near-term investments having the RTP 6.1 table as reference.

- Eric Hesse agreed that the discussion was developing in a constructive way, and many had concerns with the table. It appeared that the policy intent vs. technical corrections or additions may need to be worked out. The intent and goals of the policy should be clearly described with the JPACT recommendation, but staff on TPAC recommendations could address the additions and corrections to keep the financial policies reflected for priorities.
- Phil Healy recommended the table reflect current policy. The Port's interest with commerce is the ability to move passengers and industry and make sure the arterial system works well. Regarding footnote #3, *Limited to arterial freight facilities for ITS, small capital projects and project development*, different interpretations can define projects on arterials and intersections. It was recommended more clarity given with the arterial system.
- Jon Makler commented on the Regional Finance Approach Table 1 approved by JPACT and placed where JPACT ultimately directs it placed in the policy that provides transparency with funding strategies. It was recommended that in the motion; include having the table as an exhibit for reference, and usefulness developed to clarify language in the policy.



**MOTION: To adopt Policy 3 with the JPACT recommendation, with table removed, include the footnotes from the table with more description and clarity in the text of the report, and identify the table as an Exhibit to be used for example. The first sentence on page 11 of the report that begins “This approach is shown in Table 1...” is stricken out through the end of the paragraph, and replaced with “Exhibit 1 shows examples of funding sources and strategies to pursue transportation investments.”**

Moved: Katherine Kelly

Grace Cho wanted to clarify that her understanding of the Table is this is the adopted policy by JPACT, and this would signify significant change to policy if asked of JPACT. The policy was adopted in 2016 with updates in the table by JPACT.

Chris Deffebach had concerns with items in the table for strategies with new sources of funding, particularly for highway expansion. There was concern that there is no control over what decisions the legislature will make to funding, specifically when addressing potential funding. Ms. Deffebach was uncertain on sections described with Policy 1, but agreed that having the table as an exhibit was a good idea, and agreed on having the footnotes removed as they are included as a goal to leverage funds already listed in the policy report.

**MOTION: TPAC recommends to JPACT the approval of the 2021-2024 MTIP policy direction documents with the following changes:**

- On page 9, second sentence that begins with “As the policy direction for investments, regional partners agree to implement the policy priorities ~~the~~ that emerge from the 2018 RTP (as described in section 6.1 of the RTP) ...from these policy priorities.
- On page 11, the sentence beginning with “This approach is shown in Table 1..” to now read as “The Regional Finance Approach adopted by JPACT is presented in Exhibit A.” Table 1 would be labeled Exhibit A.

**In addition, with the recommendation, TPAC conveys to JPACT a request for oversight review of Exhibit A of regional finance approaches to funding strategies for transportation projects.**

Moved: Jon Makler

Seconded: Beverly Drottar

Discussion on the motion:

Chris Deffebach asked for clarity on what JPACT had adopted previously. It was agreed that with this new cycle policy being adopted, any further changes would be with JPACT. No further discussion was made on the motion.

**ACTION: Motion passed with one abstaining; Emily Lai.**

**7. Special Transportation Fund Allocation Update – Tabled until later date**

NOTE: Materials provided at meeting are located in meeting packet.

**8. 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Update – Tabled until later date**

NOTE: This agenda item was later made to a TPAC Workshop, scheduled Wednesday, Feb. 20, 2019. At the conclusion of the meeting, Chair Kloster announced that the RFFA workshop would have advance materials sent prior to Feb. 20<sup>th</sup>. A doodle poll will be provided for possible March 2019 dates on the rescheduled Equity Workshop.

**9. Adjourn**

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

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marie Miller".

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, February 1, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	02/01/2019	02/01/2019 TPAC Agenda	020119T-01
2	Memo	1/18/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: MTIP 1 <sup>st</sup> Quarterly FFY 2019 Completed Amendments and 2018 Semi-annual UPWP Summary Report (July – December 2018)	020119T-02
3	Memo	1/23/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: MTIP Metro Funded Project Reviews for Obligation Status Updates	020119T-03
4	Meeting minutes	1/11/2019	Draft minutes from TPAC, January 11, 2019	020119T-04
5	Resolution No. 19-4965	02/01/2019	Resolution No. 19-4965	020119T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-4965	02/01/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-4965, 2018-2021 MTIP	020119T-06
7	Staff Report to Resolution 19-4965	02/01/2019	Memo Staff Report to Resolution 19-4965 RE: February 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment plus Approval Request of Resolution 19-4965	020119T-07
8	Memo	1/25/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2021-2024 MTIP Policy Direction and Work Program	020119T-08
9	Resolution No. 19-4963	02/01/2019	Resolution No. 19-4963	020119T-09
10	Staff Report to Resolution 19-4963	3/14/2019	Memo Staff Report to Resolution 19-4963 RE: For the purpose of adopting the 2021-2024 MTIP Policy Statement for the Portland Metropolitan Area	020119T-10
11	Policy Report	Feb. 2019	Draft, 2021-2024 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) policy direction	020119T-11
12	Memo	1/25/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Policy Development Process	020119T-12
13	Memo	1/18/2019	TO: Metro Council From: Elissa Gertler, Margi Bradway, Ted Leybold CC: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Response to Council Work Session on 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation	020119T-13

<b>Item</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TYPE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DATE</b>	<b>DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>DOCUMENT No.</b>
14	Handout	12/18/18	2022-2024 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Policy Update and Implementation Timeline	020119T-14
15	2019 TPAC work program	1/31/2019	2019 TPAC Work Program	020119T-15
16	Handout	N/A	Bio of Alison Allen-Hall, PhD, Managing Director, LynxS	020119T-16
17	Handout	02/01/2019	Estimated FY 20-21 STF Formula Funding Available	020119T-17
18	Handout	02/01/2019	Summary, ST, 5310, and STIF E&D Requests in alphabetical order, Feb. 1, 2019	020119T-18
19	Presentation	2/1/2019	February 2019 Formal MTIP Amendment & Approval Request of Resolution 19-4965	020119T-19
20	Presentation	2/1/2019	2021-2024 MTIP Policy	020119T-20
21	Presentation	2/1/2019	2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation	020119T-21