

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

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

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Chris Ford
Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Katherine Kelly
Steve Gallup
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas 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
Oregon Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community member at large
The Street Trust
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
City of Vancouver
Clark County
Washington Department of Ecology

Alternates Attending

Sarah Paulus
Adam Fiss
Will Farley
Dakota Meyer
Gregg Snyder
Kate Lyman
Neelam Dorman
Glen Bolen
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

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

Members Excused

Allison Boyd
Tara O'Brien
Gerik Kransky
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Marianne Brisson
Sara Westersund
Jasia Mosley
Shawn M. Donaghy

Affiliate

Multnomah County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Washington State Department of Transportation
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
Oregon Walks
Community Member at Large
C-Tran System

Guests Attending

Adam Torres
Chris Smith
Cody Field
Henry Miller
Joe Cortright
Kyung Park
Mat Dolata
Megan Channell
Mike Serritella
Miranda Seekins
Tiffany Gehrke
Valentina Peng

Affiliate

Clackamas County
No More Freeways
City of Tualatin
City of Tigard
City Observatory
Espousal Strategies, LLC
City of Hillsboro
Oregon Department of Transportation
Portland Bureau of Transportation
Washington County

JLA Public Involvement

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Andre Lightsey-Walker, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Clint Chiavarini, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, Jaye Cromwell, John Mermin, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matthew Hampton, Michelle Bellia, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickelberry, Robert Spurlock, Ted Leybold, Tim Collins, Tom Kloster.

Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chair Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. A quorum of members present was declared. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members

Announcements from Chair Kloster

A new leadership role at Metro has been filled for the Transportation Director, Ted Leybold. Mr. Leybold noted it was an honor to be named in this new position. He is looking forward to the opportunities and challenges ahead and working with the committee. He is currently defining some of the role and work program and welcomes input.

Mr. Leybold announced his former position as Manager of the Resource Development Division has been filled by Dan Kaempff for an interim period. A new Research Director will be hired in the next year or so to manage our travel forecasting unit and GIS land use planning units.

Chair Kloster announced Kim Ellis has been hired as new manager within the Transportation Planning Unit to oversee our Climate Program. Ms. Ellis noted she is excited to build on the work with the Climate Smart Strategy and implementation through the RTP, and supporting the EPA CPRG work with Eliot Rose. We are now in the process of hiring two association planners to support both Eliot and our program. We expect to support the TSP updates to implement the new state transportation planning rules of the RTP and Climate Smart Strategy. Added work is happening in our COO’s office to develop a climate strategic framework for the agency about how Metro is working on climate across all departments.

Kate Lyman announced that TriMet has received two fairly large federal grants recently. We received a one \$25 million grant through the Federal RAISE grant program to help us construct our

fourth bus operating facility on Columbia Boulevard. Also received was \$39 million to pursue hydrogen fuel cell vehicles that will run on 82nd Avenue as well as a hydrogen fueling station to power those buses.

Monthly MTIP Amendments Update (Ken Lobeck) Reference to the memo in the packet was made on the monthly submitted MTIP formal amendments submitted June 2024. Questions on the memo can be directed to Mr. Lobeck.

Fatal crashes update (Lake McTighe) A reminder of the purpose of this monthly report was to provide a monthly update on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties. All information is preliminary and subject to change. The report includes any traffic deaths that were not included in the previous report.

CORRECTION: in the May report, Oscar Lizard Chaidez’s death was reported as a traffic death. It has been determined that his death is the result of a homicide. Metro uses ODOT’s Initial Fatal Information List to share the most recently reported traffic deaths each month. This is preliminary information and is subject to change. Some traffic fatalities may be later identified as a suicide or homicide or death before the crash occurred and are then reclassified as a ‘non-traffic death’ and removed from the crash data.

Number of deaths may be higher than the fatal crashes counted by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). NHTSA’s count excludes crashes involving suicide, private property, non-public roadways, non-motor vehicles, medical events, and deaths that happen more than 30 days after a crash.

- Information is as of 7/11/24 ODOT crash report.
- There were at least 15 traffic deaths in June, in the 3-county area (the names were read)

Once again, we have included 2 additional slides after the slide of names, to reiterate JPACT’s commitment to the Safe System approach and sharing some of the safety actions partners are engaged in. Some of the actions regional partners are taking for safer streets:

Gresham Police Dept. Pedestrian Safety Operations:

<https://patch.com/oregon/gresham/pedestrian-safety-mission-scheduled-saturday>

Oregon Department of Transportation: 2024-2025 Oregon Motorcycle & Moped Manual:

https://www.oregon.gov/odot/DMV/Pages/Online_Motorcycle_Moped_Manual/Table_of_Content_s.aspx

PBOT NE Shaver Sidewalk: NE 115th to Parkrose Middle School:

https://www.portland.gov/transportation/walking-biking-transit-safety/safe-routes/construction/ne-shaver-sidewalk-ne-115th?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery

2021 NHTSA motorcycle safety facts:

<https://crashstats.nhtsa.dot.gov/Api/Public/ViewPublication/813466.pdf>

The Hurt Report, officially Motorcycle Accident Cause Factors and Identification of Countermeasures, a motorcycle safety study conducted in the United States, initiated in 1976 and published in 1981. The report is named after its primary author, Professor Harry Hurt. The Hurt Report findings significantly advanced the state of knowledge of the causes of motorcycle accidents, in particular pointing out the widespread problem of car drivers failing to see an approaching motorcycle and precipitating a crash by violating the motorcyclist's right-of-way. The study also provided data clearly showing that helmets significantly reduce deaths and brain injuries without

any increased risk of accident involvement or neck injury.

List of findings from the Hurt report:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_findings_in_the_Hurt_Report

Link to report:

<https://web.archive.org/web/20140823225106/http://isddc.dot.gov/OLPFiles/NHTSA/013695.pdf>

Save the date: City, County and Regional High Injury Corridors Presentation and Discussion. On Microsoft Teams, calendar invite to follow, 1 p.m. to 3 p.m., August 1, 2024. Presentation will be recorded. Open to all interested parties. Join this meeting to learn about new city, county and regional high injury corridors and intersections in the greater Portland area. Metro staff will describe how the corridors and intersections were identified using roadway and 2017-2021 crash data and demonstrate how to use a new interactive tool to explore and use the data. High injury corridors are roadways with the highest concentration of serious crashes. Prioritizing systemic, corridor wide treatments on high injury corridors proactively addresses the most serious safety issues in a community. Please reach out to lake.mctighe@oregonmetro.gov with questions or to request and invite.

Sarah Iannarone noted a sobering report from Smart Growth USA - "Dangerous by Design 2024-State of the States" - OR is 19th in the US for the pedestrian fatalities, and we continue trending in the wrong direction. <https://smartgrowthamerica.org/dangerous-by-design/state-of-the-states/>

Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride noted the City of Vancouver is doing a lot of street improvement planning and considering lowering speed limits. (Sharing as a citizen not a city rep.)

<https://www.cityofvancouver.us/government/department/public-works/transportation-improvement-program/>

Regional Trails Major Investments Strategy (Robert Spurlock) Since the last meeting this was announced it was noted many of the local agencies and county folks have been helping with the effort of putting together a list of regional trail projects that have a high degree of readiness or ripe for investment. It was noted this is not like a grant program because we don't have any money. But what we're doing at the request of some Metro Councilors is putting together the list of the projects that are the highest priority for the region if we were to have money. These could be useful for advocacy efforts at the federal, state or even private funding source level. All the local agencies submitted their projects with 29 projects submitted from 19 different agencies including non-governmental agencies. We have whittled it down to 20 projects. The total funding need is over \$400 million. The link to this list was shared: <https://oregonmetro.sharefile.com/public/share/web-sd279766bb78f485f9914f45df80b8c64>

It was noted the list is for the 20 projects, not the full 29 submitted. There is still significant work needed, especially if right of way needs to be required, because typically for regional trails we don't use condemnation which could be a fatal flaw. Our next step for those 20 projects will be putting together 2-page fact sheets that include maps and graphics, photo renderings as well as a summary of the benefits. We're using a new methodology from a brand-new report to calculate DMT reduction, economic benefits and emissions reduction benefits for each project.

Designing Livable Streets Save the Date (Andre Lightsey-Walker) It was announced Metro will be hosting a Designing Livable Streets and Trails Practitioner Workshop on Wednesday, Sept. 11 at Metro Regional Center in Council Chamber from 9:00 a.m. to noon. An optional lunch and bike ride

will be offered to look at some complete streets infrastructure in the region. Providing a little background, the Designing Livable Streets & Trails was published in 2019. Mr. Lightsey-Walker will be leading the next phase of this work. The purpose and goals are informational, practitioner centered, increase understanding and awareness, and strategies for implementing our Designing Livable Streets & Trails Guide. The outcomes from this effort were shared:

- Learn what is in the guide and how to use it
- Learn how complete street design and street classifications are used to make progress on climate safety, equity and other goals
- Learn the importance of design documentation and different ways to capture the information
- Understand what type of resources and technical assistance Metro provides

A registration form will be provided by the end of the month. If interested please sign up early because there will be limited space for the event. The committee is encouraged to contact Mr. Lightsey-Walker for questions.

Public Communications on Agenda Items

Chris Smith, No More Freeways

Joe Cortright, City Observatory

Verbal testimony was provided by Mr. Smith and Mr. Cortright at the meeting regarding agenda: Rose Quarter Formal Amendment with Keys 19071 and 21219 (2 projects) Resolution 24-5424. Their written testimony was provided to the committee prior to the meeting and is included in the meeting packet on page 205.

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from June 7, 2024

Minutes from TPAC June 7, 2024 were approved unanimously with no abstentions.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment Resolution 24-5426 Recommendation to JPACT (action item) (Ken Lobeck) Project summaries with this amendment resolution was presented:

- **Key 23410 - I-84: NE Martin Luther King Jr Blvd - I-205 (ODOT):** As part the STIP rebalancing actions to address an existing ODOT funding shortfall, Key 23419 is being canceled. The project current contains only the Preliminary Engineering phase programmed and is intended to design for pavement resurfacing to repair ruts and surface wear.
- **New Project Key 23676 - Metro Transportation Options FFY25 - FFY27 (Metro):** Metro receives a regular three-year federal funding allocation from ODOT supporting the Regional Travel Options (RTO) program. The funding supplements the existing RTO program funding approved in the Metro Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The RTO program creates safe, vibrant and livable communities by providing grants and supporting efforts that increase walking, biking, ride sharing, telecommuting and public transit use. Metro and Metro will now coordinate the priorities for the use of the allocated funds.
- **New Project Key 23671 - Portland Metro & Surrounding Areas Signing (ODOT):** The formal amendment adds the new safety project to the MTIP which will provide various signing upgrades on Region 1 corridors for safety and maintenance improvements. Specific locations are to be determined. This is a regional project grouping bucket (PGB) being added to the MTIP. The \$366,837 committed to the project is being transferred from Key 22613. Key 22613 is non-MPO PGB. No action in the MTIP is required for key 22613.

- **New Project Key 23658 - Tualatin River Water Trail Access Enhancements (Tualatin Riverkeepers):** The project was awarded Recreational Trail Program (RTP) funds from the Oregon Parks and Recreations Department and will provide various access improvements to the Tualatin Water Trail. Because the project upgrades are located on the Metro Bicycle and Pedestrian networks, the project becomes regionally significant for performance measures tracking which requires MTIP programming.
- **Project Key 22613 - Portland Metro and Surrounding Areas Safety Reserve (ODOT):** The formal amendment combines the project funds into Key 23671 as noted above enabling Key 23671 to be added to the MTIP with full required funding.
- **Project Key 22431 - OR141/OR217 Curb Ramps (ODOT):** The MTIP formal amendment corrects a programming discrepancy between the MTIP and STIP (corrects and updates the per phase obligations) and adds funding to the construction phase to address a funding shortfall.
- **Project Key 21178 - US26 (Powell Blvd): SE 99th Ave - East City Limits (ODOT):** The formal amendment updates the funding levels in PE and ROW, plus adds new funds to support the construction phase.

Added note: Per ODOT 's request, Key 21709, OR120: Columbia Slough Bridge (ODOT), has been pulled and removed from the July #1 MTIP Formal Amendment Bundle. The construction phase will not be added to the project at this time. This reduces the July #1 regular MTIP Formal Amendment Bundle under Resolution 24-5426 from eight to seven projects.

Comments from the committee:

Jaimie Lorenzini had a question on project key 23613, Portland Metro and Surrounding Areas Safety Reserve (combined into key 23671). Just for my own edification, projects aren't currently identified for those funds, and those projects will be identified through investigations. I'm curious to what extent, when we have programming buckets, do those individual investments then come back to TPAC.

Mr. Lobeck noted it depends on how the bucket is programmed. In this case it could be set up just as a holding bucket for funding for a specific improvement area, meaning safety improvements and not defined, saying to be defined later. Once they are defined then we split the monies off that bucket and create a new project. And that's what we're doing with that. We're taking monies from one bucket which is generalized, putting it into a more specialized safety signing upgrade, this project. But the locations still have to be scoped out. It's kind of that first step to get to various specific project locations. This one does not have it. They have not gone through the scoping process.

Chris Ford noted we have a number of these that are programmatic for basically doing things as needed because almost all of our money is either federal or on major regional routes. It all goes through this in a way that like other cities and agencies don't have to. This in particular we've created because we don't have any money sitting around to change speed limit signs. It was noted ODOT plans to lower the speed limit on Lombard in North Portland from 35 to 30mph. But we had not money to do that which meant we had to take money from the safety reserve, HB 2017 state funds. Because of the nature of it we had to program it through the MTIP and STIP basically just to change speed limit signs. It will still take a few more months to program the money to lower the speed limit.

Noted that is sounds like there are specific locations or corridors, Mr. Ford noted what we decided to do was to create a bucket so that we don't have to come back and go through a three month

process to program money every time we want to lower our speed limit. Asked that's not just one corridor, it was noted it's that one and the others to be determined that aren't known. Ms. Lorenzini noted what the process was for when we know more information and how is that communicated back to TPAC. Mr. Ford noted this essentially is saying we're authorizing ODOT to have money to change signs. There is not a reporting mechanism to say which sign did we change. Ms. Lorenzini noted having a reconciliation of what speed limits have been changed might be useful for the next time we do traffic forecasting and understanding the safety benefits in future RTPs or high crash corridors.

Going back to the step rebalancing and administrative modification, it was noticed that a lot of changes will occur administratively. I'm curious how those will be communicated back to TPAC not as a control mechanism but just as we're gearing up for the 2025 session and making sure that we're all tracking what is the magnitude of the systematic changes that are happening and how they finally appear.

Mr. Lobeck noted he will include them as part of the monthly report back to TPAC and what changed. As far as the magnitude or how and who did that, you'll need to talk to ODOT specifically about why they chose that project over another one and what was the rationale. I won't have that. I'm basically told this part of the rebalancing action for cost cutting and cost savings that need to happen. Each program in ODOT has its own priorities on how they're going to do or not do things.

Ms. Lorenzini noted I'm interested in just a simple running list so that when 2025 hits I would see the state make us whole for projects that are being delayed. Mr. Lobeck noted he will at least provide the monthly report of what's changed. A lot of it will depend on when it comes out of the OTC city actions and things like that. I say they're administrative because all we're doing is a lot of these are in buckets. We're moving the funds around to existing projects already programmed to maintain them.

Indi Namkoong noted this may be another one where we need to dig into further. If this is something we come back with more information later, that's fine. But knowing that there's a few different OTC actions in recent and coming months around rebalancing, are these related to reprogramming funds into the Rose Quarter project or the Abernathy Bridge, or is this a separate package? Mr. Lobeck noted this is totally separate. Going into Rose Quarter, coming from basically a new discretionary grant that ODOT and the City of Portland received.

MOTION: To provide JPACT an approval recommendation to complete all required MTIP programming actions for the seven projects in the July #1 MTIP Formal Amendment under Resolution 24-5426

Moved: Jaimie Lorenzini

Seconded: Gregg Snyder

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with no abstentions.

Rose Quarter Formal Amendment (5 projects) Resolution 24-5424 Recommendation to JPACT

(action item) (Ken Lobeck, Metro/Megan Channell, ODOT) The presentation began with an overview of Resolution 24-5424. Amending and adding a total of 4 +1 projects:

- o Updating main parent project in Key 19071
- o Canceling/transferring funds from ODOT's I-5 Over NE Hassalo St and NE Holladay St in Key 21219 to new Stormwater Facilities project in Key 23682
- o Adding 2 new child construction phase projects

o Incorporating Portland’s Broadway NAE grant funded Complete Streets upgrades project into the Rose Quarter amendment bundle (TPAC prior approval has occurred)

MTIP processing and terminology details were provided.

- Project bundle support overall upgrades to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement project.
- Processing as a separate formal amendment.
- ODOT and Portland received new discretionary RCN/NAE grant funds:
 - RCN/NAE = Reconnecting Communities and Neighborhoods/Neighborhood Access and Equity grant
 - Referred to as the “NAE” grant.
 - \$450 million award to ODOT
 - \$38.394 million to Portland
- Completed Metro actions by August 1, 2024.

- MTIP “active” projects versus “prior obligated”:
 - Prior obligated = all existing programmed phases obligated.
 - Not carried over into the next MTIP and STIP.
 - The project is still progressing towards final delivery.
 - Not visible in the active years of the current 2024-27 MTIP and STIP.
 - Maintained in Prior Obligated section in the MTIP and in Historical section of the STIP.
 - I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project is currently in the MTIP’s Prior Obligated section in Key 19071.

- “Segmented/Packaged/Phased” project delivery:
 - Regular process is to obligate and deliver entire construction phase as one delivery phase.
 - Packaged = Split construction phase into multiple and separate delivery components.
- “Parent” versus “Child” projects in MTIP/STIP:
 - Parent project contains PE and ROW normally completed for entire project.
 - I-5 Rose Quarter “parent” in Key 19071.
 - Add new split construction phases become the “child” projects.
 - Adding two new Rose Quarter child projects.

Key 19071 – I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project:

The project will complete multi-modal improvements that include ramp-to-ramp auxiliary lanes, highway shoulders, highway cover, new overcrossing, SB ramp relocation, new bike/ped crossing and bike/ped facilities. The amendment includes updates to the Preliminary Engineering (PE), and Right-of-Way (ROW) phases. A new Utility Relocation (UR) phase is being added, and a new partially funded construction phase is being added using the \$450 million grant award funding from USDOT Neighborhood Access and Equity (NAE) Program/Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) Program.

The NAE \$450 million grant enables the first phase of construction to be implemented and delivered. This first phase is focused on the project’s highway cover. ODOT is proposes to use \$382 million to construct the initial, central portion of the highway cover scope element to the project. The central portion of the highway cover, between approximately Weidler and Broadway over I-5, would be built to be forward compatible with future phases of the highway cover construction and I-5 mainline improvements under the highway cover.

This portion is being programmed in Key 23682. The construction phase for this scope element is being programmed as a “child” project in Key 23682 to the main parent project in Key 19071. Key 19071 contains the preliminary engineering (PE) and right-of-way (ROW) funding for the project which is why it is referred to as the parent project.

TPAC received their notification and overview of this project during their June 2024 meeting and provided an approval recommendation to proceed on to JPACT. However, due to the project’s connection to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project, it is being added to the July # 2 MTIP Formal Amendment bundle for JPACT approval under Resolution 24-5424. There is no action for TPAC to consider for this project. It is included in the amendment bundle for information purposes.

A summary of the other four projects in this amendment:

Key 21219 - I-5 Over NE Hassalo St and NE Holladay St (Portland) (ODOT):

The lead agency/applicant for the project is ODOT. The project is located on I-5 over NE Hassalo St and NE Holladay St (BR#08583) and would replace the current structural overlay. However, ODOT, will now use the programmed \$5 million to support the required stormwater facilities upgrades within the rose Quarter project limits. The July #2 MTIP Fromal Amendment cancels Key 21219 and transfers the \$5 million to support the new Stormwater Facilities child project in Key 23682.

New Child Project - Key 23682 - I-405 and I-5 Stormwater Facilities (ODOT):

This is one of two new child projects (to the parent project in Key 19071) being added to the MTIP supporting the Rose Quarter Improvement Project. This new project will address required stormwater facility upgrades within the Rose Quarter limits. The project will utilize the \$5 million of ODIOT funds currently programmed in Key 21219. Since PE and ROW phase activities are being completed under Key 19071, only the construction phase is needed to be programmed for Key 23682. This is how Key 23682 becomes a child project to Key 19071.

New Child Project - Key 23672 - I-5 Rose Quarter: Broadway to Weidler Phase 1 (ODOT):

This is the second child project to the parent project in Key 19071 being added to the MTIP. The project will Replace 3 of the 5 aging bridges over I-5 by constructing the central portion of the highway cover from Broadway to the southern end and beyond Weidler and supporting facilities plus complete compatibility construction for follow-on packages. The required \$382 million to complete the construction phase is being sourced from the new NAE \$450 million grant ODOT secured from USDOT.

New Project Key 23646 - Broadway Main Street and Supporting Connections (Portland):

This is a separate project to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project package. However, there is an implementation and delivery connection to the I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement. The city of Portland is the lead agency for the project. The project will complete multiple complete street upgrades enhanced sidewalks including ADA curb ramps and reduced crossing distances for safer pedestrian crossings, enhanced access to Rose Quarter Transit Center, Portland Streetcar, and other transportation services. The project funding originates from Portland’s successful effort to also secure a \$38 million USDOT NAE23 grant.

Comments from the committee:

Indi Namkoong asked for a little more information about what you mean by independent utility of these project phases or of the phased approach. Megan Channell noted independent utility means

that the funding that's provided for the specific package that it can be built independent of other funding sources or other elements of the project. Taking a step back, this MTIP amendment is to program the \$450 million for Rose Quarter that was received from USDOT, from the Reconnecting Communities grant. I wanted to be clear this was money that earned and secured by the community. We worked closely with the historic Albina Advisory Board members with Albina Vision Trust, with our partners at the city and others to get this funding. It was through the advocacy of a lot of organizations represented here and community to get the funding. To specifically answer your question on the independent utility, the funding that we're putting together towards this initial portion of the highway cover that we received we can build that portion of the highway cover as an independent package. But it will be forward compatible with the remainder of the project.

Ms. Namkoong noted I'm hearing a lot of uncertainty around the future of the federal funding and grant making landscape. It's a big year. I'm seeing a lot of merit or a lot of upside in the idea of getting this part of the project over the line to complete funding, especially as we're in a state level funding crunch as well as in the amendment that No More Freeways has proposed. I'm wondering is there a downside that we see to that approach that I am missing.

Ms. Channell asked to confirm this referenced the right of way versus the construction funding piece. Ms. Channell noted the original grant application that was submitted for reconnecting communities requested design money right of way money to build the highway cover among other things. We received just a portion of the funding that we requested which includes design right of way and then the initial portion of the highway cover. So we need to have the design money to be able to design the highway cover so that we know how to build it. We also need the right of way money to be able to have the space to build the highway cover so that right of way money that's being programmed is specific to that initial portion of the highway cover. Without it we wouldn't have the space or the staging to be able to construct it. They are linked together and very specifically focused on the highway cover.

Mr. Lobeck noted that if discussion continues about that swap and you make a change or decision to do something differently, we can make the change as long as we get it in time for Council. The amendment bundle will go forward as submitted but with the understanding from Mr. Ford the proposals on the table to at least look at as part of public comment.

Gregg Snyder noted the adoption of this amendment, or the adoption of this action item will allow the project to move forward. Is this the last amendment that we see? In other words, is this one the one that we're going to have to move the project all the way through or are we going to have another MTIP amendment come through? Ms. Channell noted this is the first construction funding and it's focused on the highway cover. This is just for that construction. We have the remainder of the project to build and other elements of the project to still fund. So those future construction elements and funding infusions as they become available, I anticipate coming forward again through this process.

Eric Hesse noted given the public comment we've received; I'm wondering if you might be able to address the concern articulated around ODOT's ability to strive and how that might relate to NEPA processes which might help the committee understand the risk factors related to that. Ms. Channell noted in regard to the project in full, dating back to the 2010 time period when we were working with the City of Portland, putting together the facility plan building into what was approved for HB 2017, all the work we've done since then, and now here with the federally approved environmental

document, it's for the project in full. That includes the full build out of the highway cover that includes the auxiliary lane, one auxiliary lane in each direction that's needed to connect where three interstates are coming together, as well as other multimodal improvements. We do need the auxiliary lane to see those safety and operational improvements on the mainline. Those have been federally evaluated, approved by our federal partners as well as a national panel of experts that dug into some of the technical analysis of the environmental document to affirm that.

Mr. Hesse noted to clarify, I was curious specifically in the comment I heard raised today and in the written comments around the ability for ODOT to use the expanded right of way to then stretch into through lanes. I think that is the particular concern I've seen articulated. I'll just state my understanding is that would require itself a new NEPA process to evaluate that. And that's not what's being evaluated or proposed or possible under this project as it were to advance. Is that accurate?

Ms. Channell agreed, ODOT has no plans to add new through lanes to this segment. It is just the single auxiliary lane that connect Interstate 84 to 405 in each direction. That is what's federally approved. And again, has been part of all that planning process, and in order to do anything different, which to clarify, there are no plans for it. But in order to do anything different a new environmental process would have to be done. It was added there is a resource on the I-5 Rose Corridor website that does show the improvements in the right of way and the width of the I-5 mainline. That might be helpful to inform. https://i5rosequarter.org/media/vjldgpnui5rq_highway-widening_factsheet_remediated.pdf

Sarah Iannarone noted one of the questions I have is with the \$30 million right of way allocation, and as that relates to the separate utilities of what I think about as the above and the below projects. We think about the caps and the fact that those are bring in a significant amount of funding while ODOT struggles to pull together the money for what's happening below the caps especially given that we've got the pause on tolling. I'm wondering if something happens with the below project that would affect the right of way acquisition and where we might need to acquire the right of way based on what ODOT is able to find funding or to build below. Are there any concerns about that right of way acquisition whether or not we should think of that more iteratively based on funding availability for the project below versus the robust interest and funding for the project above.

Ms. Channell noted just to clarify, the \$30 million that would be going towards right of way is the right of way that's needed just for specific to the highway cover. As we look at our broader right of way plan where there's other right of way that would be needed for the mainline improvements. But this \$30 million is focused on the right of way to construct that initial portion of the highway cover. Future additional right of way to construct the mainline improvements will be needed. To the point you referenced, because there is a funding gap for that, it's not prudent to begin the right of way process on that until that funding is secured.

Ms. Iannarone noted to that point, thanks for clarifying. My thought would be if the financing doesn't come together for what's below the cap, wouldn't the footprint of the caps be smaller and you would need different right of way to build the caps based on the size of what's happening below?

Ms. Channell noted the build the highway cover looking at both vertically and horizontally to build

the highway cover and get the structure to be thick enough, robust enough to accommodate the buildings on top that we've planned for we are going to have to lower the profile of Interstate 5 to make sure that we still have that vertical clearance for the traffic traveling underneath and freight. In order to accommodate the highway cover we also need to have staging on I-5 to maintain traffic on I-5 while we're building the highway cover. That also necessitates the kind of build out of the width that frankly is the same as accommodating the auxiliary lane to make sure that traffic can be accommodated as we're building one portal, one half of the highway cover. The other is both a construction staging element that ties into the future build out of the highway cover as well. That is all to say they're inextricably linked.

Ms. Iannarone noted just to clarify, what I'm hearing you say is those parcels that you're planning to require would be the same irrespective of the design of the caps above or the final design of what's below. Ms. Channell confirmed.

MOTION: To recommend approval for JPACT to complete all required MTIP programming actions for the July #2 Rose Quarter Formal Amendment bundle that consists of four projects with the new Portland Broadway St project added as the fifth project for JPACT and Metro Council approval.

Moved: Gregg Snyder

Seconded: Chris Ford

Discussion on the motion:

Gregg Snyder appreciated Mr. Smith and Mr. Cortright's testimony today. I have read a lot of the materials they have prepared, not just on this topic but other topics. I appreciate that perspective. I also come from a different perspective, just in general. We are the 27th largest city in the United States. We have the 19th worst congestion in the United States, so we're punching above our weight. Vehicle speed and greenhouse gas emissions, as Mr. Cortright has noted, are inconsistent. VMT may be going down, but greenhouse gas emissions are going way, way up. However, I do think that this project, the Rose Quarter project, was a statewide priority in 2017. The legislature has thoroughly reviewed the matter. They're going to thoroughly review it again. I understand the opposition to it, but we remain fully in support of the project.

Sarah Iannarone wanted to respond a little bit to the last comment. I think there's plenty of research demonstrating that transit and TDM are the answer to congestion of freeway widening. I think we've got quite a bit of evidence showing the principle of induced demand and how that plays into our climate and mobility goals. I also want to highlight that this project that we're talking about today didn't even exist when HB 2017 was being discussed. What we're talking about today is largely the project of a lot of leadership from the Albina Vision, who through their community work was able to bring home \$488 million from the federal government based on their vision for what would be above these caps.

Further, there was a plan to pay for this through tolling which is now paused. I think references to HB 2017 while important, especially in the context of a 2025 transportation package, it's going to be time for us to start moving beyond that to the future of what we're looking at in this corridor. I'm not saying I do or don't support this amendment, but I do think that we need to reframe our thinking both in the best available technologies, policies and programs that we can put in place to manage and mitigate congestion. Also, thinking about the equity concerns and climate concerns about how we mitigate and manage congestion and how we want our precious transportation dollars spent and how we can leverage them to bring home the most from the federal government. As Albina and

Vision Trust has demonstrated, we can do so.

Motion called.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously with one abstention: Sarah Iannarone.

EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant (Eliot Rose) Mr. Rose presented the next deliverable in the EPA Climate Pollution Reduction grants with our next kick off phase of the work. The next Climate Partners' Forum meeting is Tuesday July 23rd from 1:00-2:30 PM. Please email me at eliot.rose@oregonmetro.gov if you would like an invitation or would like to be added to the EPA Climate Pollution Reduction Grant email list for ongoing updates. And check out <http://oregonmetro.gov/climategrant> for more information on the grant, including the last plan we submitted to EPA.

The EPA Climate Pollution Reduction planning grants are 4-year planning grants to create state and metropolitan area climate plans that focus on implementing ready action greenhouse gas reduction programs that align with federal and state climate funding sources. Metro is leading a grant for the 7- county Portland-Vancouver metropolitan statistical area. The first round of grants was submitted by April 1. This second round of grants will cover comprehensive relevant greenhouse gas emissions and actions planned from several federal climate funding sources.

In addition to the Portland-Vancouver area, the states of Oregon and Washington have received planning grants. Metro coordinates with both states so that the resulting plans reflect state, regional, and local agency roles and responsibilities. Besides the current members of the Climate Partners' Forum steering group potentially other agency and non-agency partners for this next phase of the grant.

The draft Comprehensive Climate Action Plan development timeline was reviewed. We are at the start of the introduction and work plan. The next phases include:

Review background information / analysis (*fall-winter '24-25*)

Screen, select, and analyze GHG reduction measures (*winter-summer '25*)

Finalize plan (*due end of '25*)

We will continue to develop this timeline based on the input we hear at the next Climate Partners' Forum meeting on July 23. Because of the time limitations at this meeting other slides were not shown. They are included in the meeting packet and in the video recording.

Comments from the committee:

Eric Hesse noted maybe related to the first phase, but I believe we might be waiting to hear this month what the announcements were regarding the first round of grants. Mr. Rose noted our region submitted \$113 million worth of implementation grant applications under that previous round of implementation grants I mentioned. In addition, the state of Oregon and Washington also submitted big packages of applications that has some funds passed through to local regional governments for climate work. We are waiting to hear back on all of those grants, and it could be July, or it could be this summer. EPA has told me slightly different things verbally versus in writing.

Karen Buehrig noted seeing Mr. Rose at the Clackamas Transportation Advisory Committee meeting the day before. One of the questions I was with the relationship of the work that's going to be done under the next stage of this project and any soft of work related to climate smart strategies. How this work may interface with work that is central to the work TPAC does. Mr. Rose deferred to Kim

Ellis to speak to the broader coordination with all the other work that our newly formed climate team is now doing.

Kim Ellis noted we are going to be working to review and update the Climate Smart Strategy and coordination with the Comprehensive Climate Action Plan. We'll bring that information forward about what we're proposing for further feedback from TPAC at your September meeting. We are still going through the review of the RTP and its climate analysis, and the reporting that we were required to do to the state. That is going to be completed later this year, sometime this fall is what we understand. That may also identify additional work or can continue moving forward implementing it.

There's also work happening at the state level the DLCD and ODOT are required to review, the Statewide Transportation Strategy assumptions, and other underlying information that were used to set our targets. That work is going to be happening also over the next year. That's due by the end of next fiscal year, June 30, 2025.

The other key piece in terms of our planning work is beginning to support the local transportation system plan updates to implement the RTP and Climate Smart, but also those new state rules. If there's other specific things that you're thinking about, please reach out and we can talk more. Those are some of the big things for now. And then we'll be mapping out other related activities that Metro and others are doing that we'll want to be sure we're involved in or coordinating and helping with work towards the next RTP update.

Ms. Buehrig noted finding the conversation around climate happening in many different venues, so I appreciate that we might be trying to align some of these conversations to make it perhaps less confusing to understand how these different elements relate and rely upon being able to look at different sources. I look forward to that and understanding more about the reorganization with different teams at Metro.

Mr. Rose clarified that while the main group of the Climate Partners Forum steers this project, particularly helping us design a process that's inclusive of everyone working on different climate issues in the region, we will continue throughout the development of this last deliverable come back and report to TPAC on the transportation side of the CPRG plan and get your feedback.

5-minute break in meeting taken

2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Next Steps – Step 2 Allocation and New Project Bond Development (Grace Cho & Ted Leybold) The presentation began with an overview of the 2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation program. A reminder was given on where we were in the process with each of the allocation categories:

- Step 1A – bond repayment
- Step 1A.1 – new project bond
- Step 1B – statewide programs & planning
- Step 2 – local projects

Next Steps – Step 1A.1 (New Project Bond)

The candidate project identification key dates and details were given. Evaluation and bond scenarios and key dates with details on bond scenarios analysis were given. Proposal Selection, Public

Comment, deliberation and decision key dates were provided.

Next Steps – Step 2

The project solicitation, evaluation and input, and deliberation and decision schedule were reviewed. Details on Step 2: Pre-Application and Call for Project, and what competitive proposals should include were provided. Outcomes to evaluation and risk assessment key dates, with public comment and decision dates was provided.

Comments from the committee:

Karen Buehrig noted there is a lot here with respect to near term actions that are required by various jurisdictions. Questions that I may have been things like are Metro going to be reaching out to jurisdictions individually, such as all of the cities and all of the transit organizations, TriMet and SMART, to be able to engage them in this process and let them know of these dates. I think specifically with regards to the Step 1 projects and the CIG and larger transit projects the importance of engaging with Wilsonville SMART. They're not necessarily sitting around this table. They may have something that falls into this category. I think that would be important.

I had a question around the Step 1 projects. I know there's a whole set of actions but was interested in when the CIG projects would be merged back in because they have a separate nomination process that the other ones. I'm assuming we'll find out on October 4 the full set. I'm interested in an idea of a sample project that would be a good fit for the safe access and transit vehicle priority. I noticed that in the CIG category you could be doing some leverage of other funds, and it wasn't clear in the safe access if that's part of it. Is there any sort of maximum cost of all of these. These all have minimum costs. I think in any of the materials it will be important to understand in the Step 1 category we're kind of what we're shooting for, maybe 50 to a hundred million in project costs I think for everything coming out of that. Those are all things that help us shape what projects we move forward. Some of us may not have been prepared to be able to do all the work that is being required early in the process. Having just a 2-week window for project nomination or that pre-application will be interesting to navigate our processes.

Grace Cho noted there are a couple things. We don't necessarily have a maximum cost. We do have cost threshold minimums that we're looking at in terms of being able to indicate at least sizing in the sense we don't typically have, say for Step 2, which is our more traditional process. We have never put a maximum cost on any of the applications. Just trying to be mindful of that. We want to see projects that come in that are trying to advance those regional objectives and don't want to artificially put any guardrails on this point. With that said, I can imagine that as part of the bond development, just like how we do with Step 2, sometimes project applications come in with the notion that they could be scaled. So that might be something for consideration.

The question about the capital investment grant and large transit capital leverage merging, your interpretation is correct. We intend to provide that as part of the summary and the screening results on October 4. That's the idea of when we will be bring all that information forward and essentially illustrate our listing which projects are then moving forward into the project evaluation phase.

The question about what's a good example of something that might fit into the first last mile, like safe access to transit category. The question about leverage I think I might try to combine a bit. The immediate thought when you posed that question I thought of the lot of interesting work done on McLoughlin Corridor where you've seen a facility plan get developed for it. There's now a carbon

reduction program. The program that theoretically I'm also working on and put an investment into testing it as a transit signal priority and being an example to be able to utilize outside of an FX style project. I can imagine there's some funding leverage there as well as looking at investments across a broader corridor. There's probably well over \$8 million of needs on that corridor.

In terms of the question about the outreach and the engagement, I think I need a little more clarity as to what is being asked. In the broad sense of outreach to our regional partners, notifying them about the opportunities we intend to push out communications through our TPAC contacts. There are also some other interest groups. Coming up with Step 2 we plan to have some updated materials on our webpage now that we're in this second phase. We are actively putting this together in advance of the pre-application period. To the degree that we can announce through the coordinating committees, I realize August is a challenging month. But we're hoping a lot of our regional partners are part of the TPAC interest and share information about these different opportunities and dates.

Mr. Leybold added that if you had a project, you think you're interested in promoting or looking at and you contact us about that, we are happy to meet with you or a jurisdiction who wants to sponsor one-on-one, either with our corridor team or with the appropriate staff that would be relevant for that type of project.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted this may warrant a bigger conversation but with the State Transportation Improvement Funds (STIF) devoting a portion of the dollars to regional coordination, I think we're starting to see more non-Metro transportation or transit providers coming into the Metro UGB. I'm curious at what point in our RFFA process we start to consider non UGB transit providers who are now providing service within the Metro UGB. We may want to contemplate this into future conversations as we increase our regional coordination.

On the logistics side of the equation, knowing that August is coming up fast and there's a short time period for the Step 2 application, if the form at the end of the TPAC packet is fairly accurate, can we start pushing that out now to try and get ahead of August recesses for some of these smaller jurisdictions? Ms. Cho agreed that form could be utilized. If you saw the sample letter of intent form for Step 2 we are not asking for a significant amount of information and the signatory on that can just be something as simple as a planning manager. There is not an intention of trying to penalize, we're trying to get a sense of who's planning and applying for what. Most important is we need to know who needs application assistance.

Ms. Lorenzini noted jumping back to the Step 1 bond side of the equation, I think the way you've laid it out is really good. But I'm concerned about the jurisdictional application limits from a logistics standpoint, knowing that one of the objectives is to invest throughout the region and also knowing what some of the CIG projects are. I'm concerned about capping or for doing a differential application rate for the counties where Washington and Multnomah County have three applications, and Clackamas and East Multnomah County have two. I think that could create a bit of political rub.

And then from the logistics side of the equation, knowing that there are very few applications that can be submitted, and anyone can submit an application, I wonder if that's going to create some coordination challenges that could result in Metro receiving significantly more applications than anticipated. To help clean that up or prevent that scenario I wonder if it might not make sense to have people submit to their counties and then having the counties be the one to submit the

application to catch potential issues before they occur. I wouldn't want to be in a situation where Clackamas County can only submit two applications, but you receive application from five jurisdictions and we didn't see it coming. Ms. Cho agreed that was a good point. Maybe the county reps might have something to say in response of whether or not they like that idea.

Dyami Valentine noted on the point about having applications submitted to or through the counties, it seemed as if that was kind of the anticipated approach, at least through the coordinating committees. Ms. Cho noted there wasn't necessarily an anticipated approach. As you've been looking through the materials the new project bond has a number of different eligibility requirements. Where I was trying to go is based off of maybe a scanner screening. It's hard for us to know whether or not we anticipate seeing the maximum caps be reached in this bond nomination process because there are a number of requirements in terms of what's expected. I want to continue to emphasize we're talking about advancing funds early, knowing we are taking away funds for the future. It's hard to say what might happen, but if we do see some caps, again, we wanted to also try to give some assurance of regional balance. There are these different caps instead of allowing maybe 9 or 10 applications come from one area or something like that. At the same time we want to be thoughtful that maybe one sub region may not use all their cap. So we may talk about a reallocation for nominations if it looks like that's happening.

Mr. Valentine noted looking at the description for the First Last Mile transit investments and I guess it was anticipated that the coordinating committees would need to prioritize if we were exceeding the caps. I was anticipating that submission process would at least somewhat funnel through the coordinating committees to understand what was being submitted at a sub-regional level. So with that in mind my comment was concern that Washington County sub region does want to participate in that. We will not be having a Washington County coordinating committee meeting in August. So we will not have an opportunity to review and vet any proposals or submissions in advance of that September 6 anticipated deadline for nominating projects. A question is how we reconcile that issue especially if we do want the coordinating committees to have an opportunity to advance these projects from a sub-regional level.

Ms. Cho noted maybe we can have a conversation offline about it. If we're talking about maybe a week of a difference in terms of a requested timing that's different those are pretty different calculus in terms of what's being asked of the process itself, which would have implications. They would have significant implications on regional partners because they schedule was intentionally put this way. But we have a year and whole new work program and we're trying to be mindful about not overburdening both processes on partners at the same time. We want to give room for the Step 2. There's not a lot of space to play with. If the county reps want to reach out and have a discussion in terms of your schedule of your caps we can chat.

Gregg Snyder noted the Step 1, a bond program is starting to look a lot like Step 2. We had originally thought that we were separating out the monies because Step 2 is this application process with a formal evaluation and public comment that certainly looks like the bond is trending in that direction. I don't know what to say about that other than it looks very similar now. A couple of key questions on the CIG larger transit capital projects. I assume that the TV Highway Bus Rapid Transit project is eligible. I assume that the 82nd Avenue Bus Rapid Transit project is eligible. I also assume that the 185th Avenue MAX Overcrossing is eligible. If there is a difference in my understanding, please correct me because I'd like to not get down the road and not have at least those three projects being counted in the CIG larger capital project step. The other thing I'd not in there is that we did see the

addition of you have to be in the high-capacity transit plan. We were not sure whether that you intended that to narrow the potential list of projects. The 185th MAX Overcrossing is in that plan, so it doesn't seem to affect it. But I'd be curious as your rational for that. It was noted as of last week the three large projects mentioned had not applied yet, unless TriMet was making the application for all three. A comment was made on safe access to transit. This could easily be different types of transit projects with a minimum project of \$8 million. Mr. Valentine's comments are valid, because many Washington County cities may want to submit applications, but if we are limited what should we pick as a county.

Karen Buehrig appreciated that Ms. Lorenzini highlighted the limits that are being placed upon this First Last Mile category which is kind of new for us to see. I want to highlight a couple of things. One, I think that they should just be removed. They're adding unnecessary complexity at this point in the process. It's requiring us to jump into this potential prioritization process with a very short time period. I think that's part of the reason why we should just remove them. I also want to highlight a little bit what Ms. Lorenzini and Mr. Snyder noted about the ones that fall into the CIG category which are 82nd Avenue, TV Highway and potentially the Overcrossing project. Those all for the most part fall in Multnomah County, the City of Portland and Washington County. Then those jurisdictions end up getting the potential for an additional or additional projects within the bond category. If we're thinking about all the cities in the jurisdictions, Clackamas County will have two that could potentially be considered. Getting to just two might be very challenging within this six-week period between now and Sept. 6. Again, my request would be let's just take those limits off. Part of the issue is we don't know how many applications might be there. So why put those limits on at this point in the process.

Ms. Cho noted I think the consideration of removing the caps we will want to discuss internally, again recognizing that any decision gets made as part of this process. There are various tradeoffs that have implications for both our partners and regional staff. Since we are looking to open the process on the 26th and put out the announcement I think we have a little bit of time to take in this feedback and consider what the different options offer, recognizing what we've heard from partners thus far.

Dyami Valentine noted interest in hearing a response to Mr. Snyder's question about eligibility because I think that's important in the way it was described and previously a little bit broader. It looks like the way the criteria that was outlined in the packet today narrows it. I think we do want to get clarification on that. And I'm not certain if the Overcrossing project is reflected in the high-capacity transit plan. I think we need to explore that to be clear. I thought I heard you say you were going to think about that and respond beyond the meeting.

Ms. Cho noted what I heard were two questions that are being asked for Metro staff to consider in terms of significant changes to the process. Either or both the removal of the application limits and the reconsideration of the deadline. Kind of interesting concepts because the limits may make the point of the timelines be less significant or may resolve this question about the timelines. Those are things I think we'd like to take offline and have some internal discussion. We're also happy to follow up directly with Ms. Buehrig and Mr. Valentine since you are particularly raising it. We will ensure that is communicated clearly back with the materials when we open the nomination process for the new project bond on July 26.

Ted Leybold added specifically to Mr. Snyder and Mr. Valentine's question about the 185th Avenue Overcrossing project being a CIG project, and whether it's in the HCT plan. In terms of the project itself CIG projects have very specific application criteria and to the Federal Transit Administration in terms of what qualifies as a CIG project. That's something we would bring in our CIG experts from our corridor investments planning area group to work with folks who are interested in if they think this is a CIG project to help determine that, even if it's not a CIG project in itself, it would still have eligibility. In terms of my understanding of the project as a transit investment itself, it just might not be a CIG project necessarily. I would want to defer to our experts on that. It's not like it couldn't be applied for, it's just whether determining or not it's a CIG project. I hope that clarifies that and given the interest we'll set up some discussions with our investment area staff to do that.

Jay Higgins asked a clarification question on RFFA. For Step 2 I want to be sure you want us to put in our pre-application regardless of whether or not we're asking for assistance or not. The other question I had regards the short timeline to get projects into RFFA. Is there a penalty in other projects if late in being submitted and included in the process? Ms. Cho suggested airing on the side of more if you have more application ideas than less. The pre-app is not restricted to steps. You also have application limits and caps per sub region. Just be aware of that. But there's not necessarily a penalty if you elect not to apply for one or if it turns out to be a different project. At least we knew the project came from Gresham. We're trying to make this transparent and being able to gauge offers community organization the opportunity to get involved in the earlier stages of the process.

Adjournment

Chair Kloster announced the August 2 TPAC meeting had been cancelled. The TPAC workshop is scheduled August 14 and next regular committee meeting is September 6. There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, July 12, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	7/12/2024	7/12/2024 TPAC Agenda	071224T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	7/5/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 7/5/2024	071224T-02
3	Memo	7/2/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments: June 2024	071224T-03
4	Minutes	6/7/2024	Draft minutes from TPAC June 7, 2024 meeting	071224T-04
5	Draft Resolution 24-5426	N/A	Draft resolution 24-5426 FOR THE PURPOSE ADDING, CANCELING, OR AMENDING A TOTAL OF SEVEN PROJECTS TO MEET FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	071224T-05
6	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5426	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5426	071224T-06
7	Staff Report to Resolution 24-5426	July 3, 2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: July #1 FFY 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-5426 Approval Request – JL24-10-JUL1	071224T-07
8	Attachment 1 to Resolution 24-5426	August 1, 2024	Key 21178 - US26 Powell Cost Increase Draft OTC Staff Report	071224T-08
9	Draft Resolution 24-5424	N/A	Draft resolution 24-5424 FOR THE PURPOSE ADDING TWO NEW PROJECTS AND CANCELING ONE EXISTING PROJECT FROM THE 2024-27 MTIP, AND AMENDING THE PREVIOUSLY OBLIGATED ROSE QUARTER IMPROVEMENT PROJECT TO MEET FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	071224T-09
10	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5424	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5424	071224T-10
11	Staff Report to Resolution 24-5424	July 3, 2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: July #2 FFY 2024 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-5424 Approval Request – JL24-11-JUL2	071224T-11

12	Attachment 1 to Resolution 24-5424	January 2024	Rose Quarter General Fact Sheet	071224T-12
13	Attachment 2 to Resolution 24-5424	N/A	Rose Quarter Project FAQs	071224T-13
14	Memo	July 5 2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner Ted Leybold, Transportation Planning and Policy Director RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – New Project Bond and Step 2 Next Steps	071224T-14
15	Handout	N/A	2028-2030 RFFA – Step 1A.1 New Project Bond Candidate Project Nomination Form (DRAFT July 2024)	071224T-15
16	Handout	N/A	Sample letter of intent – Step 2	071224T-16
17	Presentation	7/12/2024	Fatal Crashes Update Report for TPAC July 12, 2024	071224T-17
18	Presentation	7/12/2024	Save the Date: Designing Livable Streets and Trails Workshop	071224T-18
19	Public Comment Letter	7/10/2024	Comment Letter RE: MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-5424	071224T-19
20	Presentation	7/12/2024	July #1 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-5426	071224T-20
21	Presentation	7/12/2024	July #2 2024 Formal MTIP Amendment I-5 Rose Quarter Improvement Project bundle	071224T-21
22	Presentation	7/12/2024	Comprehensive Climate Action Plan Kickoff	071224T-22
23	Presentation	7/12/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Next Steps – New Project Bond & Step 2	071224T-23