

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

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

Date/time: Friday February 2, 2024 | 9:00 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
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Tara O'Brien
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Bill Beamer
Marianne Brisson
Sara Westerlund
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
Community member at large
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
Oregon Walks
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Washington Department of Ecology

Alternates Attending

Sarah Paulus
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Dakota Meyer
Gregg Snyder
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

Multnomah County
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Troutdale and Cities of Multnomah County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Chris Ford
Lewis Lem
Sarah Iannarone
Jasia Mosley
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy
Danielle Casey

Affiliate

Oregon Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
The Street Trust
Community member at large
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration

Guests Attending

Camilla Dartnell
Casey Gillespie
Cody Field
Jean Senechal Biggs
Jeff Owen
Mat Dolata
Max Nonnamaker
Russ Doubleday

Affiliate

Kittelson & Associates
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Tualatin
City of Beaverton
HDR
City of Hillsboro
Multnomah County Health Department
Kittelson & Associates

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Caleb Winter, Clint Chiavarini, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, John Mermin, Kate Gregory, Kate Hawkins, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Monica Krueger, Ted Leybold, Tim Collins.

Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Vice Chair Leybold 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

- Dyami Valentine announced a soon-to-be-posted Assistant Planner in their long-range planning department at Washington County. The posting is expected to come out mid-March.
- Eric Hesse announced the Portland Winter Light Festival will be starting soon. The link was shared in the chat. <https://pdxwlf.com/>
- Neelam Dorman shared a construction update. The Hall Boulevard on-ramp to OR 217 south is closed for two months, starting Jan. 22. Crews are rebuilding and reconfiguring the ramp to ensure it seamlessly connects to the new auxiliary lane.
<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/or217/pages/default.aspx>
- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted during early to mid-January. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.
- **Fatal crashes update** (Lake McTighe) The monthly fatal traffic crash report for Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was given. It was noted this was preliminary data shared by ODOT and news reports.
- **Reminder to review draft UPWP prior to March 1 TPAC discussion** (John Mermin) It was announced the draft 2024-25 Unified Planning Work Program has been sent to committee members for their review prior to discussion at the March 1 TPAC meeting. The document has also been sent to Federal and State partners who will be reviewing the document at the consultation meeting Feb. 28. Those interested in attending this meeting can send an email to Mr. Mermin; his email was shared in chat.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from January 5, 2024

A correction was noted from Jaimie Lorenzini: Page 8 of past minutes (packet page 19), line 3; change “train ridership” to “transit ridership”. Minutes from TPAC January 5, 2024 with this correction were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment Resolution 24-5384

Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Ken Lobeck) The February 2024 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment bundle adds or amends a total of seven projects. There are three new projects being added to the MTIP and four existing projects being amended. Three of the projects belong to ODOT with the remaining four impacting TriMet. Full details were described in the packet.

ODOT Existing Project Amendments:

US26: SE Powell Blvd & SE 36th Ave (Safety upgrade project)

Addresses phase cost increases. The cost increase is \$782k to project.

Oregon Transportation Network - TriMet FFY23

The eligible State STBG is reduced. The STBG reduction totals \$2,461,508.

TriMet Existing Project Amendments:

Enhanced Seniors Mobility/Individuals w/Disabilities (2026)

Update 5310 estimates and add Local overmatch funding to the project for 2026

Enhanced Seniors Mobility/Individuals w/Disabilities (2027)

Update 5310 estimates and add Local overmatch funding to the project for 2027

New Project Additions to the MTIP and STIP:

Oregon Transportation Network - Ride Connection

\$1,979,194 award of ODOT managed federal Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds

TriMet Line 33 Traffic Signal Priority Upgrade

Adds the Metro awarded CRP funded project to the MTIP/STIP to support the development and implementation of a Transit Signal Prioritization upgrade along Line 33 (along McLoughlin Blvd)

82nd Ave Bus Rapid Transit Project Development: PDX - Sunnyside Ave

Adds the TriMet project development project supporting engineering requirements through NEPA and final design to help secure a later FTA Capital Improvements Program Small Starts grant.

Comments from the committee:

Gregg Snyder asked, with the exception of TV Highway Bus Rapid Transit project, have all the carbon reduction bonds been now programmed in the MTIP? Are there any outstanding at this point? Mr. Lobeck noted there are two remaining still in program development status. The 82nd Avenue allocation was just done last month. The TriMet Line 33 Traffic Signal Priority Upgrade is \$4 million of the Metro Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) award.

Karen Buehrig asked why the 82nd Avenue BRT project had 2 numbers. Why a separate fund approved last month and then this project, which is separate but the same type of work. Mr. Lobeck noted TriMet and Metro staff are involved in this project. It was ruled to move forward with the scope of activities as

two separate projects. They discussed it with FTA, which approved the approach. That's why you have two projects doing the same objectives to meet NEPA requirements and project design. Not the normal method and process, this being a bit different. Vice Chair Leybold added there are 2 separate grants which require 2 separate development phases. Mr. Lobeck noted this process was primarily to streamline the reimbursement process and show how the division of labor and scope will occur.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted the packet utilizes the phrase "flex transferred" a bit. What does this phrase mean - i.e., when something is "flex transferred" to FTA? Thank you! Mr. Lobeck noted when submitting the funds that are awarded to the project that are Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds they would normally be awarded through the process of FHWA obligation process through the Financial Management Information System (FMIS). It would be under the control management of ODOT and FHWA to implement and deliver the project. When you flex transfer funds, you take the funds (FHWA based) and turn them over to FTA for the delivery process.

Neelam Dorman wanted to clarify the language and totals with funding dollars on the 82nd Avenue project. The one we did with Metro funds last month with the TriMet match came a certain number. This one is ODOT Federal funds with TriMet required match, and with TriMet's overmatch it totals over \$30 million. Tara O'Brien added we need to show the full \$30 million committed and available this month in order to fully enter into project development for the project. The reason it's split into two projects is to show the full cost of the development of the project in the MTIP. VC Leybold added this also allows TriMet to submit further development grants with the project.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation of Resolution 24-5384 to add and amend the seven projects to the 2024-27 MTIP.

Moved: Tara O'Brien

Seconded: Neelam Dorman

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Overview of Emergency Transportation Routes Phase 2 project (John Mermin) The presentation began with a brief history of regional emergency transportation routes planned and adopted leading up to this phase 2. The Phase 2 work (2024 – 2026) (Identified in RTP ch.8) will:

- Prioritize and tier network routes
 - Data review and assessment
 - Workshops and engagement
 - Develop and apply methodology
- Conduct desk research on operational guidelines

It was noted not included in the scope of the projects is an evacuation plan, establishing operational guidelines, or any funding decision.

The project timeline, engagement approach, and decision-making process was reviewed. Next steps in the project include RDPO and Metro to finalize sub-recipient agreement, briefings to TPAC, MTAC, and Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO) work groups to spread word, recruit a project work group of regional partners to meet quarterly, and select a consultant for the project.

The project team is in the process of forming a work group, made up of about 20 staff from agencies around the 5-county region, including transportation planners and emergency management professionals. To keep the size manageable, we are seeking one representative per agency to meet quarterly throughout the project. The representative would be responsible for coordinating with relevant staff at their agency. Interest to serve on the quarterly work group can contact Mr. Mermin.

Comments from the committee:

Dyami Valentine noted in the decision-making graphic it showed TPAC off without a connection to JPACT, but would assume there will be the typical information shared between the committees. Mr. Mermin agreed. From the timeline the duration of the project might have been missed. Mr. Mermin noted the project begins Spring 2024, and the funding needs to be spent by Spring 2026. The bulk of the work would be done by the end of 2026. Mr. Valentine noted he'd want to confirm who we had contacted in the past for representatives with Emergency Response to serve on this workgroup.

Karen Buehrig asked how the steering committees formed and who serves on them. Mr. Mermin noted the steering committee was the RDPO Steering Committee which is a standing committee, so it doesn't need to be formed. The only committee that needs to be formed is the Quarterly Project Work Group. It was asked if this was something that RDPO ultimately approved or approved by JPACT because it's going into a document. Mr. Mermin noted we are asking for endorsement from JPACT, Metro Council, the SWRTC Board, and RDPO Steering Committee and RDPO Policy Committee. These are the elected bodies and what was done with the project in Phase 1.

Ms. Buehrig confirmed it a document that lives on its own and endorsed by many agencies. Mr. Mermin added it was a part of recommendations that might be part of what to consider in the next RTP. It's not part of the RTP, but we could put some of the results of the project in the appendix of the RTP.

Eric Hesse noted that related to the Federal Protection Program, there are state and regional resilience protection documents referenced in the statute that correlate to different match requirements. It was asked if there were regional documents that could be related this in the sense of resiliency plans. Mr. Mermin this was not a resiliency plan but a related topic, and will follow up with this after some research on the matter.

Jaimie Lorenzini asked when the names for the Project Work Group should be submitted. Mr. Mermin noted in the next month.

Gregg Snyder wondered what would activate such a network. Is it the Cascadia Subsection Zone, or an instance like the recent ice storm. Would we evacuate in certain disasters? Reference was made to the multiple stakeholders across the region. Mr. Mermin added the network could be useful to all types of regional disasters.

2027-30 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Revenue Forecast (Grace Cho)

Information on the draft MTIP financial forecast was provided. It was noted that this is a required element of the MTIP process, it provides an overall funding context for upcoming allocation processes and decisions, it is not a commitment of funds to allocation programs or specific projects, and only includes expected federal and state generate revenues only. A little over \$1.1 billion of revenue estimated for the region is consistent as was programmed for 24-27 and 21-24 MTIP cycles.

The revenue forecast has certain caveats: Tolling and/or future pricing program revenues are not included. Not all revenues are included in the MTIP, with examples given. And Federal discretionary does not include any anticipated awards for Portland area major projects. Funding allocation discussion began with ODOT in Fall 2023, with the 28-30 RFFA kick off this month. TPAC will have updates shared from ODOT programs, RFFA programming, and transit agency budgets over the course of the MTIP process.

Comments from the committee:

Tara O'Brien asked how is this different than how it was approached in previous MTIP revenue forecasts. Have any assumptions changed? Processes changed? How is this different from the RTP revenue forecast. It was thought the MTIP is short term and not including any potential discretionary awards in the MTIP.

Ms. Cho noted the revenue forecast does include discretionary awards. ODOT has a placeholder for potential discretionary awards which focus on smaller awards. The approach and process to the revenue forecast is fairly similar to what has been done in the past. There is more focus on federal revenues. The main difference is the 24-27 cycle were separated out for the typical allocations minus the federal discretionary revenues (table 1 in the packet), and what is the revenue forecast going to be if adding some expected revenues around state and local funds. State revenues that get passed through to counties and cities. There are more breakdowns to identify allocations compared to last cycle that lumped allocations together.

VC Leybold noted the RTP forecast does serve as the starting point for the MTIP forecast. In particular, the RTP does try to give a comprehensive outlook for local revenue sources and describe those as well. One other slight difference is when we are looking short term at the MTIP revenue forecast, the longer term forecast for the RTP financial forecast. Some agencies are a little more conservative with the MTIP forecast, based on more recent existing levels of funding that assumed growth in that funding assumed in the long-range forecast because they're not trying to over promise in the TIP. As part of the presentation, at this point we did not include tolling revenues or the large federal discretionary grants programs assuming we'll get on of those in this timeframe. Whereas in the long range forecast we did assume those long range federal discretionary grants for the big capital projects. For the TIP, with those funds if award happens, we can accommodate those and bring them into the TIP.

Karen Buehrig noted initially it was hard to understand why we wouldn't include the federal discretionary grants. It may be there are buckets named that we know we get and those we assume we get? Are we capturing those federal discretionary funds that have been awarded? Ms. Cho noted the key with the MTIP revenue forecast is a snapshot at the beginning of the process to give us context of the next 4-yr program. It's heavily focused on federal formula programs that get allocated into the region. As long as there is a reauthorization process in place, we feel confident with the funding. We believe with our history of federal discretionary grants to include that in our revenue forecast. It depends on how comfortable different agencies felt about including that at this stage. Any federal discretionary grant is getting programmed in the TIP. This forecast is not a barrier for programming federal discretionary grants, it's just some context for helping us understand as we start the next development of the TIP.

Ms. Buehrig noted as a way of thinking of this perhaps is as the way we are doing the process now, trying to estimate the funds that are going to be available in that time period that basically will be guiding our choices for how we frame up our MTIP policy for the 3-year period, which would play that self out as step one and step two. But this forecast that we're generating is basically telling us the amount of money that we'll be able to divide up. It's really not the money that has been targeted for a specific project, it's the money that we will be seeing to spend, with choices on how we spend it.

Ms. Cho clarified that one, the TIP policy is more comprehensive than just the RFFA funds. This forecast laid out is more monies that not only have authority for MPOs to allocate out, but funds from all ODOT funding programs that have been discussed and decided what to forward to the Oregon Transportation Commission for consideration with directions on those funds. It's also the federal formula programs with transit agencies as well. It's a much more comprehensive picture. The initial revenue forecast is starting the process of a new TIP. It will be an interesting way to look back and see how far off we were in actual revenue in terms of what was actually awarded over the course of the process, and what we end up adopting starting a new TIP cycle.

VC Leybold noted we're calling the process the RFFA program direction, not policy. But it is providing that context for development of that program direction, but also provides direction for what do we want to comment on for ODOT funding program allocations. How does that fit into the bigger picture with all the money coming into the region or expected to come into the region, when we're commenting on these programs or transit budgets, and how they are proposing to program their funding. It was noted with the MTIP the burden of proof with fiscal constraint is much higher than the RTP with discretionary funds. We cannot assume what was built into our forecast.

VC Leybold noted it might behoove us to clarify in the forecast that there is the expectation in the region of going after some of these large discretionary grants, and that should play into the context this report is providing. We may want to reserve some of our flexible funds for some discretionary funds to local discretion to set aside some matching funds for large projects. This is something we can look back on with the forecast to at least have a description of with this context.

Jaimie Lorenzini asked does this cycle look if we contemplate inflation and reduction in purchasing power. Ms. Cho noted the last 2 cycles at the time of adoption and what we are forecasting now are pretty close. We saw a smaller amount get programmed in 2024-27 compared to 2021-24. There is probably a reduction of purchasing power with inflation, but the 21-24 cycle still reflected major revenues coming in through FTA for the retainment of the Portland/Milwaukie light rail project. Factors around timing, grant awards and major projects actively taking place differ, but the amounts tend to be stable across the board with perhaps a smaller number of projects in the cycle. Ms. Lorenzini added it will be interesting to see how we can use this MTIP forecast for other forecasts to start messaging the regional funding need, especially as JPACT starts considering priorities in the next legislative session.

Gregg Snyder provided an example of a Hillsboro transportation system development change where there was a 9.3% inflation increase to the project cost. Potential increase with similar projects from revenue streams could reduce purchasing power to about 20% in 2 years. The 2025-27 RFFA is estimated for 152.8m, but the total available funds from Table 2, page 114 in the packet, show an increase of only 11% to 153.1m. That means a dramatic decrease in the purchasing power for projects in this cycle with inflation factored in.

It was noted the difference in the carbon reduction program from Metro compared to ODOT, in that ODOT has this listed in its revenue forecast for 14.2m a year, but Metro did not include this program in the RFFA allocation. This may be placed outside the RFFA programs, or listed separately? Ms. Cho noted the carbon reduction program is included by Metro to be allocated but is listed separately and will be discussed at the next presentation at the meeting. The \$153.1m does include the carbon reduction program.

Dyami Valentine agreed that we are seeing a decrease in what we're forecasting. From a context piece it sounds like we're capturing some pessimistic views from agencies, we are not anticipating as much revenue, and further on our purchasing power significantly is eroded. Having this brought through in the conversation is an important aspect. Also, that we are capturing a moment in time, based on the conversations you've had. In terms of ODOT, based on their forecasts recently shared, it seemed much more dire further on. This didn't seem captured in this forecast. Is there any reconciliation there? Ms. Cho noted it is actually captured in this forecast, working with ODOT state office and regional office staff to put the ODOT revenue allocations together with OTC adoption document late last year. What might have been allocated further out is now tied to their bond obligations.

Eric Hesse referenced page 126 of the packet, "ODOT estimates that there will be \$70,571,951 of unallocated funds". This puts the discussion in more context for where potential shortfalls with project funding forecasts can play a part. Discussion was held on interpretation of Table 2, and where RFFA and the Carbon Reduction Program was listed. The total 3-year RFFA funds are \$153.1m. The Carbon Reduction Program are 2027 carry over and years 28-30 are \$15.5m making a total of \$168.6m when included with RFFA. Metro will continue to assume those funds are available for the carbon reduction program.

It was asked where the recent Interstate Bridge Replacement project award announced for \$600m would fit with this forecast, if at all, recognizing that it hasn't been formally awarded, but that is the type of project that would be reflected in these programs in the fiscal years being discussed. Ms. Cho noted we did not include any major project awards in this forecast. They have not been programmed through any federal discretionary funds yet. When awarded they would be programmed and amended into the appropriate fiscal year TIP.

VC Leybold noted you may recall we did an initial forecast 24-27MTIP and then when the reauthorization bill passed and changed the numbers, we did an updated version. It might happen again. We made a lot of assumptions with growth rates or lack of growth rates on the revenue side for the years outside the authorization. Appreciation was given to the committee on their input, noting they would be putting in more description that the region is planning to apply for these grants. It was recommended to add more language regarding reduced purchasing power due to inflation and rising costs. And more context around amount of funds in the tables regarding programs and how they relate to each other.

A 5-minute break in the meeting was taken.

2027-30 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation Program Directions (Ted Leybold & Grace Cho) Background information, components and functions of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) was given. The MTIP roles of staff, partners, committees and Metro Council was given. The 2027-30 MTIP process and timeline was shown. The MTIP program direction was described. Next steps with the program include gathering and summarizing input and forming recommendations toward JPACT review.

The 2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) was presented with background information. The relationship between RFFA/MTIP/STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program) was explained. The RFFA roles, process and timelines were given. The 2028-2030 RFFA Program Direction framework has two steps:

Step 1 (ongoing investments & bond payments) –

- Project development and construction bonds
- Regionwide transportation investments
- MPO, Corridor & System planning

Step 2 (capital projects) –

- Advance 2023 RTP Goals
 - Safe System, Equitable Transportation, Climate Action, Mobility Options, Thriving Economy
- Topical or geographic focused investments
- Regional scale impact, leverage funding, positioning

The step 2 project proposals and evaluations were described including call for projects, technical evaluations, risk assessment, and timeline. The steps toward final adoption of the 2028-30 RFFA was provided. A note regarding the Carbon Reduction Program was made. Work is happening for the continuation of program, there is a separate process to mitigate risk in case the program does not get reauthorized, to the degree possible, will coordinate with RFFA, and the proposal will be brought forward at a later date. Next steps with the RFFA program include gathering and summarizing input and forming recommendations toward JPACT review.

Comments from the committee:

Allison Boyd if it was known which TPAC meetings were planned to bring more information about the funding breakdown of the RFFA allocations. As an example, what committed under Step 1, proposed for projects under Step 1, or what should be in Step 2. My other question is on the project delivery training series listed on the TPAC workshops. What will those cover? It's possible different people will attend them such as planners, engineers, or those writing the applications.

Mr. Lobeck noted Metro would like to see all types of attendees because those are who draft the applications and can discuss reviews and know what will be applicable. The first workshop covers the basics with formulas and questions to answer. In April we could cover project scoping including requirements and cost estimates. Coming in Fall we'll cover more specific conditions with funding. Generally, cover tips and best practices learned from past cycles.

Ms. Cho noted in terms of specific meeting dates, which is what was assumed in trying to understand the capacity level with Step 2. The April meeting will give a good idea starting the Step 1 numbers. Right now, we are aiming to collect initial input. With that said we have provided our initial forecast with the RFFA program for the 3-year cycle. Ms. Boyd noted there are some services already calculated, and wondered when we'd get some of that breakdown and where it was going in Step 1, or not.

Dyami Valentine thought it sounds like some of that service may be retired in this timeframe. Interest was given in how that may impact some of our program direction discussion. Regarding the carbon reduction program, it would help to understand that the work Mr. Rose is doing fits into the programming of some of the outcomes of the Climate Pollution Reductions draft work. Hopefully we are making that link at some point with some of the needs and opportunities as applied through the eligibility requirements for the Carbon Reduction Program. A suggestion was given for when presenting to JPACT and Metro Council to show the MTIP/STIP relationship slides incorporated into the forecasting to show context.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted hearing that RFFA invests across the region. Other partners in the region have noted that achieving geographic parity across this process can be challenging. This is understandable given the federal government doesn't allow us to set our place and sites of a project that the region asks for. Thinking of solutions to achieve geographic parity some ideas come to mind. One is providing more support for smaller agencies or requesting county subareas request "X" amount of funding. Interest in learning more on how we could bring more balance to this process, recognizing that we can't suballocate, and how we could incorporate that into our policy direction.

When asked for more clarity on the balance of funding projects across the region and how to address this, Ms. Lorenzini noted that in the last cycle we had a bit of a phenomenon where Clackamas County submitted several lower cost projects. As a result, they received less, but also didn't receive the full balance for projects submitted. There are feelings about proportionality around the region, and often when we talk about proportionality people liken this to receiving a share of the pie relative to other higher populations. This is not the case with RFFA because we don't look at population share. So how do we look at areas that are trying to provide this geographic representation to encourage more applications from these areas where parity is reached with competitive applications submitted.

Ms. Cho notes this is part of our process as the starting point and good feedback to know how best to plan our program direction. The key we have been moving toward with the RFFA process is driving toward outcomes. We want to recognize that we want to invest across the region and have a regional impact in leveraging funding. We are thinking about all that in the context of how we advance our regional transportation plan goals. That's why we haven't placed more definition in the applications while not setting limitations but to provide best opportunities.

Appreciation was given for the helpful context and emphasis on outcome driven goals. The offer was made to help support these efforts. A second question asked, looking at the last application cycle, it seemed there were some issues or challenges in projects with employment areas. Interest was given in looking forward how we could think about criteria and process to better support those types of projects, recognizing that they also advance our regional outcomes.

Tara O'Brien asked for clarification to understand the difference between what is asked for TPAC and JPACT with the program direction versus the funding allocation. Is it feedback and discussion around the program direction? Is it about the actual amounts of funding available in Step 1 and Step 2? Is it the policy guidance, related to the RTP goals? It would help to understand what was given on page 153 of the packet with the presentation today to line up expectations. It was assumed we're not talking about the funding allocations in the next few months, but the broader guidance.

Ms. Cho noted the program direction is how the region targets these funds with the RTP goals and objectives. The program direction starts to outline the criteria for Step 1 of the RFFA that we will review with technical evaluations for Step 2. For Step 1 it's about discussion of our commitment to repay our bond and discussion of maintaining our regional programs. Further discussion with the program direction includes feedback on program criteria for Step 2. It was asked if the April discussion will focus on generally expected amounts of funding to be available in Step 1 or Step 2 and discussion around potential changes to the criteria or program direction for those. Ms. Cho agreed and would welcome input.

VC Leybold noted that regarding the bond payment schedule, it is anticipated to go down in this cycle from approximately \$21m to \$17m, equating to roughly \$4m in capacity that will not be tied up in the payment process. The reduction from the bond payment commitment this period could play into comments for Step 1 and factored in with programming.

Ms. Buehrig found the graphic that described where the MTIP was related to key partners (ODOT, TriMet, SMART) helpful in understanding our discussion. Integrating that into the presentation about revenues was suggested. There was confusion about the Feb. 14 meeting with discussion on program direction listed, but hearing the next time we talk about this is in March. Ms. Cho noted workshops can hold discussions on program direction but haven't been clearly defined yet. It was noted it would be helpful to be able to understand as we think about the RFFA, maybe at the Feb. 14 meeting, for people to see the different elements that are included in Step 1 and Step 2, so people have a broader idea of what they are responding to.

It was suggested that at some point in time we have a presentation about past accomplishments through the various programs and what has been spent for reaching goals. Interest was given in the corridor program as part of Step 1, understanding the type of projects and how projects are selected that RFFA works on in the corridor program. We need to be sure we are giving ourselves enough time to have information on the funding and that funding conversation. It seems we are hearing it may come to us in April; does that mean seeing actual amounts, and then discuss further in May with recommendations in June? The sooner we have this information the better.

One of the questions in the presentation was whether things should be brought to the coordinating committees. It was thought there needs to be more shape, since our discussion now with comments is challenging and would expect the coordinating committees to find it challenging also. Perhaps more useful in the April timeframe with information to respond to ahead of time. There is expectation of conversation happening around the bond repayment in Step 1.

Referring to the graphic showing the relationship between organizations and MTIP, one thing that came out of the RTP was the direction to have a more detailed review process when the tolling process came into the MTIP. We have to sync and have more information as we move the project into the MTIP. That fits in with the connection between ODOT and MTIP. The same could apply with RFFA and MTIP. We're still interested in what that will look like and if/how it relates to this conversation.

VC Leybold noted we are working on putting together a description with methods of operationalizing the tolling process when the MTIP amendment and process is brought forward. And then take that direction forward in the RTP when a tolling project is proposed to be amended into the TIP. It's probably on a parallel track with this discussion, but it's less about the program direction for the TIP or RFFA, but for the allocation process ODOT is leading for selecting projects with formula funds to be brought into the 27-30 TIP.

This input was appreciated in learning more about the process and could be applicable and used even before this specific cycle as we discuss the program direction on the 27-30 cycle. Ms. Cho added the workshops scheduled will provide an overview of Step 1 programs and extend into more details for Step 2 in further workshops scheduled.

Eric Hesse appreciated hearing in more detail what the future meetings will cover. It was believed the programs are particular interest due to investments in a regional scale and how delivery of the programs will be planned. Ongoing projects between cycles could be given time in presentations to provide information on where they are now, and how these investments are working for leveraging or directed correctly.

The RTP alignment was noted in the materials. In particular, the fifth goal in the RTP (prosperity), where clarity was asked if during this summer more would be discussed about specific criteria to measure this and included in the program direction. Last cycle included a specific performance measure around this. Identifying where this fits into the program direction and other phases planned would be helpful. Ms. Cho added the amount of measurement designed will depend on how much agreement we can get to with program direction in the May-June timeframe. If we get to something similar to what we had in the past cycle with 95% in terms of defining measurements for the technical evaluation criteria, then we can adopt and finalize this summer.

Mr. Hesse anticipates hearing interest with economic perspectives including developing new job centers in the region while evaluating existing conditions in various criteria for funding. Appreciation was given on issues raised by Ms. Lorenzini to help people engage in the process, recognizing that this may feel it's the only available funding there, but acknowledge we are talking about federalized funding which provides challenges to some application expectations. The application process and proposed outcome targets require consideration with an equity lens. State and local funding could also be applied to reach those outcomes with a perhaps less restrictive equity lens.

Gregg Snyder noted there was good conversation at the Washington County Coordination Committee about these items and wanted to reflect back on some feedback. This has been one of the only discretionary programs we had, which as mentioned, is less than 5%. This is the time where we can educate JPACT at the level of transportation planning decisions with the amount of funding, and how little this is compared to other funds.

Regarding the coordinating committee and the process of applications. There was some discussion shouldn't the County collaborate more closely as a coordinating committee to ensure a great slate of projects to be proposed. It was believed this would be helpful. The ability to coordinate on a closer level at the County level might encourage projects that might not otherwise come forward, recognizing the point of federalization.

This cycle is not the first done, so is there a section of lessons learned for the workshop coming up? If we drive the program direction in the manner that becomes less complex, then the more we can focus on intended outcomes and reduce administrative costs. Regarding the corridor projects, interest was given in hearing more about with priorities identified. Regarding outcomes in the last process, it was noted 3 out of every 4 dollars went into the Portland region, which was probably good and justified, but would it apply this time? It was suggested we should be mindful how we propose these allocations given there are regional projects everywhere. The idea of project reductions is challenging when awarded only part of what was requested. Where does the project go without the full funding, to start or wait? What we've invested so far, can we take them all the way to the end?

Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Miller

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, February 2, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	2/2/2024	2/2/2024 TPAC Agenda	020224T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	1/23/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 1/23/2024	020224T-02
3	Memo	1/24/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments during early to mid-January 2024	020224T-03
4	Draft Minutes	1/5/2024	Draft minutes from TPAC 1/5/2024	020224T-04
5	Resolution 24-5384	N/A	Resolution 24-5384 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING OR AMENDING SEVEN PROJECTS IN THE 2024-27 MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	020224T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5384	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5384	020224T-06
7	Staff Report Memo	1/24/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: February 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-5384 Approval Request	020224T-07
8	Memo	1/26/2024	To: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Metro and Carol Chang, Regional Disaster Preparedness Organization (RDPO) RE: Overview of Regional Emergency Transportation Routes (RETR) Phase 2 project	020224T-08
9	Memo	1/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner Ted Leybold, Resource Development Manager RE: 2027-2030 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Revenue Forecast	020224T-09
10	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1: Summary of Forecast of Federal and State Transportation Revenues Portland Metro Area Transportation Federal Fiscal Years 2027 through 2030 (in millions)	020224T-10
11	Attachment 2	February 2024	2027-2030 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Revenue Forecast Initial Draft	020224T-11

12	Memo	1/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2027-2030 MTIP Program Direction and Work Program	020224T-12
13	Attachment 1	1/10/2024	Attachment 1: 2027-2030 MTIP WORK PLAN SUMMARY	020224T-13
14	Memo	1/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner Ted Leybold, Resource Development Section Manager RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Schedule and Process Overview	020224T-14
15	Attachment 1	1/1/2024	Attachment 1: 2028-2030 REGIONAL FLEXIBLE FUND ALLOCATION work plan summary at-a-glance	020224T-15
16	Slide	2/2/2014	January traffic deaths in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington counties	020224T-16
17	Presentation	2/2/2024	February 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24- 5384	020224T-17
18	Presentation	2/2/2024	REGIONAL EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION ROUTES (RETR) PHASE 2	020224T-18
19	Presentation	2/2/2024	2027-30 MTIP Revenue Forecast Initial Draft	020224T-19
20	Presentation	2/2/2024	2027-2030 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)	020224T-20
21	Presentation	2/2/2024	2028-2030 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA)	020224T-21