

# Meeting minutes



Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) Workshop**  
Date/time: Thursday July 14, 2022 | 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

---

**Members Attending**

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair  
Karen Buehrig  
Allison Boyd  
Chris Deffebach  
Eric Hesse  
Jaimie Lorenzini  
Jay Higgins  
Don Odermott  
Lewis Lem

**Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
City of Portland  
City of Happy Valley & Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County  
Port of Portland

**Alternates Attending**

Steve Williams  
Sarah Paulus  
Dyami Valentine  
Dayna Webb  
Glen Bolen

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
Oregon Department of Transportation

**Members Excused**

Lynda David  
Tara O'Brien  
Chris Ford  
Karen Williams  
Laurie Lebowsky  
Idris Ibrahim  
Jasmine Harris  
Katherine Kelly  
Rob Klug  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Jeremy Borrego  
Rich Doenges

**Affiliate**

SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Community Representative  
Federal Highway Administration  
City of Vancouver  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

**Guests Attending**

Alan L. Thompson  
Brett Horner  
Camilla Dartnell  
Carla Staedter  
Gary P.

**Affiliate**

Oregon Department of Transportation  
  
Kittelson & Associates  
City of Tigard

**Guests Attending**

Jean Senechal Biggs  
 John Williams  
 Lance Calvert  
 Melissa Johnston  
 Will Farley  
 One unidentified caller

**Affiliate**

City of Beaverton  
 City of West Linn  
 City of West Linn  
 City of Troutdale  
 City of Lake Oswego

**Metro Staff Attending**

Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner	Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner
John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner	Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner
Ken Lobeck, Senior Transportation Planner	Robert Spurlock, Senior Regional Planner
Jodie Kotrlík, Resource Program Coordinator	Marne Duke, Senior Regional Planner
Matthew Flodin, Intern	Miranda Seekins, Intern
Noel Mickelberry, Transportation Planner	Summer Blackhorse, Program Assistant
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder	

**Call to Order and Introductions**

Vice Chair Leybold called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed. The link for providing ‘safe space’ at the meeting was shared in the chat area.

**Committee and Public Communications on Agenda Items - none****Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) / Trails Bond (Dan Kaempff & Robert Spurlock, Metro)**

Mr. Kaempff began the presentation by noting the purpose of the workshop was to discuss sources of available information and funding examples, and gain input used in developing draft recommendations for discussion in August TPAC meeting. The upcoming schedule of RFFA/Bond TPAC and JPACT discussions was reviewed. The process for selecting projects with RFFA and Bond funds was provided.

The risk assessment evaluation considerations was briefly reviewed. The public comments report on proposed projects for 2025-27 regional flexible funds and Metro Parks and Nature trails grants were noted in the packet. Information to be used for project evaluations were described that included Outcomes Evaluation, Risk Assessment, Public Comment, Coordinating Committee Prioritization, RFFA process objectives, Previous RFFA award, and additional considerations.

Funding package examples for discussion and refinement that were provided in the packet showed illustrations of different methods for developing a starting point for funding packages, provide a policy-based rationale for a funding decision, not balanced to available funding, and additional information is not yet factored into these examples, but will be used in recommendations.

Brief descriptions of each example was provided:

1. Overall – This example illustrates the package of projects created by sorting the projects by their overall outcomes ratings. It does not move any of the “Either” projects into one funding source, but shows them in each project group for comparison purposes.
2. Overall, with projects moved – This example is similar to the previous one, but it moves the following projects into the funding sources.

3. Construction emphasis – This example focuses on completing projects. It first funds projects requesting funding up to and including the construction phase, then funds lower cost project development funding requests up to the existing funding amount.
4. Project development emphasis – This example focuses on ensuring there is a pipeline of sufficiently planned and developed projects in order to prepare for upcoming funding opportunities. It funds projects in a manner similar to the Construction emphasis example but prioritizes projects seeking planning or project development funding.
5. Specific outcomes emphasis – This example illustrates how the outcomes ratings in specific criteria areas can be used to develop project packages. The example shown combines the averages of the Equity and Safety outcomes and uses those results to prioritize projects.

Comments from the committee:

- Alan Thompson noted that when talking about equity we often think of benefits to historically marginalized communities with lack of investment opportunities, but we should also look at the dis-benefits that affect these communities such as gentrification or other dis-benefits that may occur from these developments.
- Jean Senechal Biggs asked what the thinking was behind including the archeological investments in projects, which are not typically a factor in planning. They would be addressed in design and construction of projects. Why factor archeological in with the evaluation? Robert Spurlock noted the range of probability within the planning project where this factor may fall, which could be useful for grant recipients working with the tribes who would be concerned addressing human remains in future work that would cause harm.

It was asked how much of this has gone into the project risk assessment. Camilla Dartnell noted the cultural resource assessment was not included in the criteria. It's a consideration, but not part of the project evaluation. Mr. Kaempff added the cultural resource assessment was more advisory on how applicants could revise their project scope. If projects are funded they are funded for all considerations.

- Don Odermott asked how the formulation for the risk assessment scores were developed. Ms. Dartnell noted the risk assessment had 2 levels; what could be controlled or the inherent risk with less control on project factors. Asked if there was a worksheet on specific projects for this, it was noted the memo had this, which provides every criteria, how it was weighted and different factors, and scored low, medium, and high for each criteria. Vice Chair Leybold added that initial ratings were provided to all applicants who had time to reply back with clarifying questions or further feedback. TPAC can choose to include the risk assessments as part of project evaluations in their recommendation to JPACT.
- Karen Buehrig expressed interest in the outcomes emphasis application tab in the spreadsheet and interest in how TPAC may apply the RFFA objectives. In the outcome emphasis trials bond project it appears they would fall above the line for funding with the exception of the Cornfoot Road project. With the RFFA projects the above the line leaves about \$6m still unallocated. Approval was given for the allocation mix of project types in the outcome analysis.

Vice Chair Leybold summarized that it was generally support of outcomes based approach but taking into account some broader RFFA objectives to hold a conversation on what remaining projects get included in funding projects throughout the region. Ms. Buehrig agreed, noting the context of RFFA objectives is not specifically woven into the scoring, so still open to a conversation about certain projects moving into the funding category.

- Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on overall projects moved, and if ranked by how much funding. Does the overall include funding in both categories? The reality is that some projects will need to move and will not get double funded. If projects are put in the trails pot do we need to know if Metro Council will support this, or otherwise we are making assumptions?

It was noted the emphasis on construction of fund development, and whether this was fair or not, since the direction for what was applied for didn't say one way or the other would be prioritized. The submissions might have been different. It was important to see the differences for project deliveries. It was noted that regarding outcomes analysis and projects moved to not leave anything on the table.

Vice Chair Leybold noted he heard abdicating against an emphasis on construction or development, and just let this play out without emphasis on either one. Mr. Kaempff added that specific to the Council Crest Trail project they requested from both funding pots specific amounts totaling \$5.5m. That was example one. In the second example we put all their requests into the RFFA category. One may be more appropriate for the recommendation.

Mr. Spurlock further clarified the projects moved and noted that the bond funding is a Council decision. It was noted that when we went through the program direction with RFFA we talked about the four priority outcomes from the RTP, and if these would be weighted. The decision was made to not predetermine or weigh outcomes, but provide outcomes analysis for decision makers to consider.

- Allison Boyd asked if we are waiving safety and equity from decision makers and where would that fall in the process determining our recommendations from TPAC to JPACT and Metro Council. Is TPAC coming up with several options for JPACT? Vice Chair Leybold noted typical of the process is have TPAC recommend one option to JPACT. Mr. Kaempff added the input and direction we hear from TPAC provides this recommendation to JPACT. The question on focus for particular criteria we could share with JPACT. If projects have strong focus on certain criteria these would be noted.

Ms. Boyd agreed on the focus just on safety and equity with all other criteria kept equal as has been from the beginning of the process. Regarding the emphasis on construction and fund development it was agreed to not change direction at this point, but would advocate previously funded RFFA project investments that have proven effective and moved forward. It was noted that we make the last bit of that funding work for balance of RFFA objectives.

- Cindy Dauer noted the outcomes based approach was good, timely and relevant, and all criteria is important and selected for that reason. Safety and equity have emerged as significant importance with regional support for these investments.
- Don Odermott noted the spreadsheet with summarizing data. It was asked what the highlighted projects on the project emphasis sheet meant. Mr. Kaempff noted this indicates projects in 2 categories. The decision is needed on which package/category this would be funded. Mr. Odermott noted that at the bottom of pages there are tables that list counties and cities with percentage of dollars funded. Is there a method to see projects in 100% or 150% comparisons across the region? With the five different options of priorities, it was asked if a merge of these could be created. It was recommended to finish with previously funded RFFA projects to complete projects. Mr. Kaempff noted that with regional funding distributions the table and examples show project numbers and how much money of distribution. Different

types of projects are asked among jurisdictions, but more information on distribution across the region can be developed.

- Dyami Valentine noted an error in the spreadsheet under overall projects moved, with a Washington County project missing work credited that was missing. The recalculation in the spreadsheet will be corrected.
- Eric Hesse asked that in terms of projects eligible for both funding pots, is it appropriate for the coordinating committees to recommend funding from the two sources of funding. Mr. Kaempff noted the examples in the spreadsheet for reference, with staff interested in hearing of questions on the information.
- Karen Buehrig noted it would be helpful for TPAC's recommendation that if a project is in a proposed recommendation for funding, it shows more clearly which project funding source this is coming from. Mr. Kaempff noted that part of this discussion helps in making determination between funding sources leading to the recommendation to JPACT.
- Chris Deffebach asked for clarification on projects in planning development and construction. Mr. Kaempff noted way it shows in the spreadsheet is per criteria project sorting, and just because projects are shown in the 100% list or gray areas of examples doesn't mean these projects are not being considered. Additional information is being used for moving projects up or down for consideration. Vice Chair Leybold noted it appeared the project development emphasis and construction wasn't favored for factoring into consideration. Rather, let outcomes drive the decision. Mr. Kaempff added a summary of project construction vs project development projects can be added to the spreadsheet as more discussion takes place.
- Cindy Dauer noted that zip codes were not part of the survey results in the public engagement report. The demographics showed a disproportionate slant in race and income, with diverse voices not represented in the report, showing why equity should be more prioritized. It was noted culturally equitable organizations are asked to respond many times, but are not involved or have burnout for multiple asks. Mr. Kaempff noted that page 37 of the report shows a map of respondents rather than zip code. And agreed it's a challenge to gain information from diverse populations and organizations to reflect critical responses.
- Don Odermott agreed with the struggle to get diverse voices heard from public engagement. It was noted that information from project development and construction projects for ranking is insightful and should stay part of the consideration leading to the recommendation of funding.

Vice Chair Leybold noted it appeared the project development vs construction information could stay included with consideration in the materials, but it's not specific to the ratings outcome. What is not supported is bringing back a project package option that emphasizes either, but having information still wanted with maybe a balance between them. Mr. Odermott agreed, noting that when we melt the 5 criteria we may see common threads and trends.

Mr. Kaempff paraphrased for a recap on comments:

There is a desire for a deeper look at the outcomes based approach with additional information regarding regional distribution as well as how we're funding project development vs construction. With regard to the #2 overall approach with the same details, when placed together projects may rise in ranking from common threads.

Vice Chair Leybold added to the recap, with the common threads ranking also using the overall RFFA criteria to balance in the remaining funding to make sure we are funding projects across the region.

- Karen Buehrig agreed as accurate, but wanted to see both project objective outcomes and overall projects moved to show comparisons. Mr. Kaempff agreed this information would be moved forward.
- Jean Senechal-Biggs agreed with the outcomes with project moved, but also adding some more variations to scenarios such as equity and safety that provide a clearer picture. Combinations of factors could be considered.
- Don Odermott would like to see across the entire package which projects we already put Federal fund into. The purpose of this is to avoid projects not completed and having to pay back funding. We have commitments to local jurisdictions and assigned Federal money, which should be completed.
- Jean Senechal-Biggs noted a column for previous RFFA funding, but could have other Federal funding sources not included in the column. It would be helpful to highlight this gap in project funding if possible.
- Chris Deffebach noted importance of caution about past projects and weighing successes. Past cycles began to predetermine project funding and limit options. This highlights the risk assessment.
- Vice Chair Leybold noted other factors yet to weigh in and how strongly we should have them influence a package of options. One of these factors is the sub-committees regional priorities that may change priorities when consideration is made across the region with projects.
- Karen Buehrig noted that at TPAC individual jurisdictions could make these corrections with project priorities if needed.

Mr. Kaempff provided closing remarks. If the committee had any other comments or questions they could reach out to either himself or Mr. Spurlock. The next steps will be summarizing this discussion to add to the presentation to JPACT and Metro Council work session. Coordinating committee input will be added to this, and the recommendation for funding will be coming to TPAC at the August meeting.

**Committee comments on creating a safe space at TPAC** – none received.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Vice Chair Leybold at 11:44 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, July 14, 2022

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	7/14/2022	7/14/2022 TPAC Workshop Agenda	071422T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	7/12/2022	TPAC Work Program as of 7/12/2022	071422T-02
3	Memo	7/12/2022	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE: Development of Regional Flexible Funds/Trails Bond Funding Options	071422T-03
4	Memo	7/7/2022	TO: Dan Kaempff, Ted Leybold, and Robert Spurlock Metro From: Camilla Dartnell, PE, Russ Doubleday, and Hermanus Steyn, PE, Kittelson & Associates RE: 2025-27 Regional Flexible Funds and Trails Bond Risk Assessment	071422T-04
5	Letter	7/11/2022	From: Clackamas County Coordinating Committee Re: Prioritization of the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) and Metro Parks Trail Bonds	071422T-05
6	Report	Updated July 5, 2022	Regional Funding Allocation: Outcomes Evaluation Report 2025-2027 Regional Flexible Funds Parks & Nature Trails Bond funding	071422T-06
7	Links to spreadsheets	N/A	RFFA / Bond examples for TPAC discussion, updated	071422T-07
8	Report	July 2022	Engagement report: Public comments on proposed projects for 2025-27 regional flexible funds and Metro Parks and Nature trails grant	071422T-08
9	Appendices	July 2022	Appendices: Public comments on proposed projects for 2025-27 regional flexible funds and Metro Parks and Nature trails grant	071422T-09
10	Presentation	July 14, 2022	Developing funding recommendations for 2025-2027 Regional Funding: RFFA + Trails Bond	071422T-10