

# Memo

Date: October 25, 2019  
To: TPAC and interested parties  
From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner  
Subject: 2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation Package Approaches

---

## **Purpose**

Staff is seeking input from TPAC on a preferred approach to developing a draft JPACT recommendation for discussion and action at the December TPAC meeting. Additional public comment and risk assessment information is available and staff has developed two potential approaches to assist TPAC in their discussion.

## **Background**

At the October meeting of TPAC, Metro staff briefed the committee on the RFFA policy objectives, technical ratings and risk assessment of the Step 2 project applications. An update on the public comment responses to date was also presented.

In the ensuing discussion, staff requested feedback from TPAC on ways to use this policy direction and the four sources of information (technical ratings, risk assessment, public comment, and coordinating committee priorities) to develop a recommendation to JPACT. In particular, TPAC was asked for input on ways to address the low number of projects seeking funding through the Freight category.

In preparation for their November RFFA discussion, TPAC indicated that they wanted to look at package options that followed the 75/25 percent targets for the Active Transportation (AT) and Freight categories, but that also considered means of funding additional projects that have benefits in both categories.

## **Approaches to developing a draft recommendation**

In response to this input, Metro staff have developed two potential approaches (Options 1 and 2) for developing a recommendation for TPAC to consider and discuss. These options, plus supporting data, are included in the meeting materials.

Both options focus on the project technical ratings as the primary means of determining whether or not a project is funded. The difference between the two options is in which funding category (AT or Freight) projects are placed. Applicants had the option of requesting their project be considered to be eligible in both funding categories, recognizing that some projects provide both AT and freight mobility benefits. Projects requesting consideration in both categories are placed in the Freight category, due to the low number of applications received in that category. Option 2 reflects an expanded list of projects which could be considered eligible for consideration in both categories and places them in the Freight category.

**Option 1 – 75/25 + Technical Rating.** This option funds two of the three projects identified by applicants as Freight projects, plus two Multnomah Co. projects requesting consideration in both funding categories, with the Freight category funding target. There is a remainder of \$479,098 left in the Freight category, which is not sufficient to fund the next project (Sherwood: Blake St.)

The AT category funds the top eight projects, with \$481,767 left unallocated in this category, which is not sufficient to fund the next project (Oregon City: 99E).

Staff findings:

- From a technical perspective, this package funds lower-rated projects self-identified as eligible in both categories. The lowest technical rating funded in the AT category is 15.2; it is 8.4 in the Freight category.
- Overall number of projects funded = 12
- Balancing needed in final project selections for both categories

**Option 2 – 75/25 + Technical Rating (w/additional Freight projects).** This package option moves five AT projects which have Freight benefits, and could thereby be considered for funding in both categories, into the Freight category. The primary means of determining the Freight eligibility of an AT project is providing mode separation for AT modes on (or parallel to) a designated regional freight route. Staff analyzed the project proposals and identified five AT projects which met this criterion<sup>1</sup>:

- Forest Grove: Council Creek Trail
- Washington Co.: Cornelius Pass Bike/Ped Bridge
- Oregon City: Hwy 99E Bike/Ped Improvements
- Gladstone: Trolley Trail Bridge Replacement
- Tigard: Red Rock Creek Trail

The option shows all five projects moved to the Freight category, as they all had a higher technical rating than other projects in the Freight category that would still receive freight target funding. As illustrated, this package funds eight projects in the Freight category and six in the AT category, based on technical merit. The Freight category has a remainder of \$151,373 which is not sufficient to fund the next project (Multnomah Co.: 223rd Ave.) The AT category has \$2,455,827 remaining which is not sufficient to fund the next project (Washington Co.: Aloha.)

Staff findings:

- Technical performance improved slightly with this package; lowest rated project funded is 8.8
- Funds 14 projects (more than Option 1)
- More equal treatment of project applications with benefits to both funding categories
- Balancing needed in final project selections for both categories
- Impacts to balance of projects across the region identified for funding

These options represent only two of many approaches to meeting the RFFA policy objectives for TPAC to consider and adapt as they may so choose. They should be considered as starting points for developing a recommendation to JPACT. They have not yet been adjusted to address:

---

<sup>1</sup> These projects are shaded blue in the accompanying Excel spreadsheet labeled "Option 2"

- Balancing to the total funding available in each category and overall
- The RFFA policy objective to fund projects throughout the region (without consideration of sub-allocation of funding)
- Consideration of risk assessment input, which may result in a funding award for project development activities only
- Coordinating Committee and City of Portland priorities, which may result in a project with a lower technical rating being included in the recommendation in lieu of a higher rated project
- Public comment input, showing relative support for projects
- Ensuring investment in a sufficient number of CMAQ-eligible projects

Further input from TPAC is needed at the November 1 meeting to indicate how they wish to use policy direction and these additional sources of input in developing their recommended package of projects to JPACT at their December meeting.

### **Responses to Risk Assessment Report**

Staff from Kittelson and Associates reviewed the methodology used to develop their assessment of each project's relative degree of risk. While none of the projects have a degree of risk sufficient for them to be eliminated from consideration, applicants were provided the opportunity to provide responses indicating how they intend to address any issues raised through the risk assessment. The deadline for responding was October 23 and three responses were received from applicants (Forest Grove, Milwaukie, Tigard). The responses are captured in the Excel spreadsheet tab labeled "detail." This information may be used both to develop Conditions of Approval and/or to limit funding on a project (such as only funding a project development phase) to mitigate risks as a recommendation to JPACT is developed.

### **Public Comment Report**

Input gathered through the public comment period (September 6 – October 7, 2019) is available at [oregonmetro.gov/RFFA](http://oregonmetro.gov/RFFA). Due to its size, it is not included with the materials for this meeting, but is available as a tool to help TPAC in its development of a recommendation to JPACT.

Public support is illustrated alongside the technical ratings and risk assessment outcomes in the Excel matrices included with the materials for this meeting. The relative level of support for each project is based on the percentage of the total number of comments received for each project (through the online survey tool) that indicated a "high" or "very high" level of support. The calculation for these percentages can be found on the spreadsheet tab labeled "detail." The relative degree of public support is illustrated as shown below in Figure 1.

**Figure 1:  
Indicators of Level of Public Support**

% comments "high" or "very high"	Number of projects	
> 80%	6	
66-80%	10	
50-65%	7	
<50%	0	

All projects had at least 50 percent of their responses indicating “high” or “very high” support, so it can be inferred that the public response showed general support of all the proposed projects.

The overwhelming majority of the responses gathered in the public comment effort were captured through the online survey tool. 2,895 responses were submitted via the survey tool of a total of 2,973 responses submitted.<sup>2</sup> There is additional public input for each project, as well as demographic information detailed in the report, that is available to TPAC and coordinating committees to use in their determination of their priorities.

If specific concerns or issues were identified through public comments, those may be addressed through development of Conditions of Approval for a particular project.

**Draft Conditions of Approval**

Applicants whose projects are selected for funding will be required to adhere to the RFFA Conditions of Approval (attached). Conditions of Approval are to ensure projects are completed as applied for and approved by JPACT and Metro Council. Please see the attached document for details. Project-specific Conditions of Approval will be developed and added to this document after the final selection of projects has been determined by JPACT and Metro Council.

**Additional materials**

Included in the materials for this item are project letters of support received from State Senator Laurie Monnes Anderson and State Representative Carla Piluso.

---

<sup>2</sup> There were additional responses received that were not relevant to the RFFA process, and are not included in this total.