

# Meeting minutes



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**  
Date/time: Friday, November 1, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.  
Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

---

## **Members Attending**

Tom Kloster, Chair  
Jeff Owen  
Allison Boyd  
Dyami Valentine  
Judith Perez Keniston  
Eric Hesse  
Jay Higgins  
Mike McCarthy  
Chris Ford  
Gerik Kransky  
Lewis Lem  
Bill Beamer  
Sarah Iannarone  
Jasia Mosley  
Indi Namkoong  
Ashley Bryers  
Katherine Kelly

## **Affiliate**

Metro  
Clackamas County  
Multnomah County  
Washington County  
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council  
City of Portland  
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County  
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Port of Portland  
Community member at large  
The Street Trust  
Community member at large  
Verde  
Federal Highway Administration  
City of Vancouver

## **Alternates Attending**

Karen Buehrig  
Dayna Webb  
Will Farley  
John Serra  
Glen Bolen  
Jason Gibbens  
Christopher Carle

## **Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County  
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County  
TriMet  
Oregon Department of Transportation  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Clark County

## **Members Excused**

Tara O'Brien  
Laurie Lebowsky-Young  
Sara Etter  
Steve Gallup  
Shawn M. Donaghy  
Danielle Casey  
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

## **Affiliate**

TriMet  
Washington State Department of Transportation  
Oregon Walks  
Clark County  
C-Tran System  
Federal Transit Administration  
Washington Department of Ecology

**Guests Attending**

Adam Torres  
 Anthony DeSimone  
 Cara Fitzpatrick  
 Haziell Garcia  
 Jean Senechal Biggs  
 Jonathan Maus  
 Laura Terway  
 Mat Dolata  
 Max Nonnamaker  
 Miranda Wilson  
 Tiffany Sleeman  
 Trevor Sleeman

**Affiliate**

Clackamas County  
 Clackamas County  
  
 City of Beaverton  
 BikePortland  
 City of Happy Valley  
 City of Hillsboro  
 Multnomah County  
  
 Oregon Department of Transportation  
 Oregon Department of Transportation

**Metro Staff Attending**

Abigail Smith, Alex Oreschak, Ally Holmqvist, Anthony Cabadas, Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Cindy Pederson, Eliot Rose, Hanna Howsmon, Jai Daniels, Jaye Cromwell, Jeremy Kwok Choon, Jessica Martin, Kadin Mangalik, Kate Hawkins, Ken Lobeck, Kim Ellis, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickelberry, Nubia Martinez, 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**

Lewis Lem encouraged people to visit the Portland International Airport to see the improvements and new look at the terminal. If you'd like a tour or walk-around, please reach out. Gerik Kransky added congratulations to the Port of Portland for your Clean Port Program grant award from EPA this week. <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-announces-27m-clean-ports-investments-oregon>.

Sarah Iannarone announced the public comment period is open for the Interstate Bridge Replacement project. The Street Trust in partnership with Oregon Walks has been running an Active Transportation working group. We've been doing walks and rides on both sides of the river with the public to explore the connections and routes and gather feedback to shape and complete a network of people walking, biking and trying to access public transportation through this investment. We're having a workshop that's open to the public. This will be held next week via Zoom. If any of your staff are preparing letters or comments on the draft SEIS by the November 18 deadline you are welcome to drop by. We are happy to share our observations and what we are going to be highlighting in our comments with you to help you prepare your remarks. Contact was given for sending the Zoom invite.

**Monthly MTIP Amendments Update**

Chair Kloster noted the memo in the meeting packet providing information on the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments for November 2024 Report. Ken Lobeck can be contacted for further information.

Fatal crashes update (Anthony Cabadas) The monthly update on the number of people killed in traffic crashes in Clackamas, Multnomah and Washington Counties was given. Some of the actions regional partners are taking for safer streets were highlighted:

- Portland and Oregon State Police: Conducted a coordinated traffic enforcement mission focused on high-crash corridors and areas that have recently seen tragic traffic fatalities. The one-day event resulted in 189 traffic stops, 150 citations, 116 warnings, 4 arrests, 1 vehicle towed. Koin 6 story: <https://www.koin.com/local/multnomah-county/authorities-issue-hundreds-of-citations-in-portland-traffic-enforcement-mission/>
- ODOT Crash Analysis & Reporting Unit: Developed the Initial Fatal Crash Information Viewer providing up to date geocoded information on fatal crashes in Oregon. Access the Viewer: <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Data/Pages/Initial-Fatal-Info-Viewer.aspx>
- National Safety Council's Road to Zero Coalition: Published an important new report: "Massive Hazards: How Bigger, Heavier Light Trucks Endanger Lives on American Roads." Read the report: <https://www.nsc.org/getmedia/18f9c2b1-eb20-4a3e-b916-8f96161a9a26/rtz-light-trucks-report.pdf>

Chair Kloster added appreciation to those able to attend the recent Complete Streets workshop at Metro. It was a good discussion on designing to reach safety goals and build community. A survey will be sent out soon to get your feedback and input on next steps. More workshops are planned.

Transit Minute (Ally Holmqvist) It was reported that about 4% more ridership has been added than last year. In the news section this month improvements on the Portland Streetcar to attract riders include ability for riders to track better schedules in the system. A collaborative project lead by the City of Vancouver in partnership with C-Tran recently reallocated underutilized roadway space on Fort Vancouver Way and 4<sup>th</sup> Plain Blvd. to implement continuous bike lanes. Ride Connection launched their Bethany link shuttle on Oct. 14. This shuttle was in Washington County's most recent transit development plan, funded through TriMet Regional Coordination Program and is free to the public.

An update was provided on the Community Connector Transit Study. Feedback was received that we should have more city representation in the project and on the working group. We have sent out invitations to our city representatives that are already involved in Metro's advisory committees. We're working with folks to make sure that those nominations are carried forward for the next few meetings. That's something that we'll be bringing back to the policymakers to share as well.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation – Update on Step 2 Applications (Ted Leybold) The memo in the packet from Grace Cho was noted describing where we're at in the Step 2 process for the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation. Step 2 is the project nomination and selection process for the smaller capital projects across the region. Many agency folks are working on those application now. They are due Nov. 15. If you are looking for some assistance, we have open houses Thursday to help you with any of those. Also help with our new vendor provider database as applications are online this cycle. After that Step 2 process we'll be doing our analysis evaluation for performance analysis and the risk assessment doing that in parallel with the bond process that you'll be hearing more about in the future agenda items. If you have questions, you can contact Ms. Cho or myself for additional information.

Metro/RTC TMA Certification Review Online Open House Presentation (Chair Kloster) The Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration are conducting a certification review of

Metro and SW Washington Regional Transportation Council transportation planning processes. A public comment opportunity is open now through Dec. 13, 2024.

The Transportation Management Area Certification Review is a federal requirement for metropolitan planning areas with populations over 200,000 people at least once every four years. Metro is the federally mandated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) designated by the governor to develop an overall transportation plan and to allocate federal funds for the region. After the certification review is conducted, the federal review team will issue a report that summarizes the findings by April 12, 2025. The final report certifies the MPO's planning process for the next four years. To comment, review the [online open house presentation](#) and send your comments to Matthew Pahs, Planning and Freight Program Manager, FHWA – Washington Division. Federal Highway Administration – Washington Division [matthew.pahs@dot.gov](mailto:matthew.pahs@dot.gov) More information is available on the Metro website: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/news/public-comment-opportunity-provide-feedback-metro-s-transportation-planning-process>

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from October 4, 2024

Motion to approve the minutes from October 4, 2024 made by Chair Kloster.  
Motion passed with no objections and one abstention: John Serra.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 24-5443 Recommendation to JPACT Action Item (Ken Lobeck, Metro) The amendment can be divided into two basic project categories: Adding new projects with various federal fund awards and adjusting and amending two existing projects primarily to shift and update the project authorized project funding.

**New projects being added to the MTIP as part of the October FFY 2025 Formal Amendment bundle:  
Supplemental Planning: Civil Rights & Community (Clackamas County):**

The MTIP formal amendment adds the Safe Street For All discretionary awarded planning project to the MTIP for historical accounting purposes. The project is a FHWA FFY 2023 Planning and Demonstration grant award planning project. Clackamas County is delivering this project as a direct recipient working directly with FHWA. Clackamas County has already completed their requirement with FHWA, obligated the project funds, and received their Notice To Proceed (NTP) allowing them to begin expending funds. This award will be used by Clackamas County to update its existing Transportation Safety Action Plan to integrate equity and community engagement and align the plan with the SS4A Action Plan requirements.

**Portland Metro Area 2024-2027 ADA Curb Ramps, Phase 2 (ODOT):**

The formal amendment adds the new ODOT ADA construction phase project grouping bucket to the MTIP supporting region-wide construction of ADA curb and ramp safety upgrades on multiple routes including I-5, OR8, OR10, US26, OR47, OR99W, OR127, OR141, and OR217 in Hillsboro, Tigard, Beaverton Tualatin, Forest Grove, and Sherwood to meet compliance with the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

**Portland Metro Area 2024-2027 ADA Curb Ramp Construction:**

The formal amendment splits \$10,850,000 from the ODOT Non-MPO ADA construction support project grouping bucket and commits the funding to the ADA curb and ramps project in Key 23602 above.

**I-5: Interstate Bridge, NB Electrical Components (Portland) (ODOT):**

The formal amendment re-adds this project to the MTIP and STIP to enable the construction phase to re-obligate the funds and move forward to complete the project.

**Portland Streetcar Montgomery Park Extension (TriMet):**

The formal amendment adds the PE and Other phases for the project to the MTIP and STIP. TriMet and Portland are contributing a total of \$41 million of local funds to complete required project development activities (NEPA and final design) along with the need to procure streetcars to support the route extension. TriMet is pursuing a FTA Small Start Capital Investment Grant (CIG). By adding the PE and Other phases now, TriMet can establish the pre-award authorization clock which enables the local funds to be counted as part of the required match to the FTA Small Starts grant.

**Existing projects being modified in the MTIP as part of the November FFY 2025 Formal Amendment bundle:**

**Portland Metro Area 2024-2027 ADA Curb Ramp Construction:**

The split funding from this project in support of Key 23692 is addressed in the New Project section after the description for Key 23692.

**Enhanced Mobility E&D (5310) - Tri County Area FY26:**

Change name to be: **Oregon Transportation Network - TriMet FFY26):**

The formal amendment reduces the authorized State STBG funds to the project from \$4,968,103 to \$1,700,000. The total programming amount decreases from \$5,536,725 to \$1,894,572. The reduction occurs from an allocation revision from FTA which is has also been approved by OTC.

**MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT to complete all required MTIP programming actions for the six projects in the November FFY 2025 MTIP Formal Amendment under Resolution 24-5443.**

Moved to approve: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Chris Ford

**ACTION: Motion passed with no objections or abstentions.**

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Eligibility Screening Results Summary

(Ted Leybold, Metro) It was noted that as part of the adoption of the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Program Direction, regional leadership agreed to the development of a new project bond proposal (known as Step 1A.1) for consideration by the region. A six-week project nomination period was held in late Summer 2024 where regional partners submitted a total of ten project nominations.

Following the end of the nomination window, the project submissions were screened for eligibility. The purpose of screening is to verify the nominated projects meet the necessary eligibility requirements applicable to all projects and those additional eligibility requirements specified for certain transit project categories. A summary of the final results of the eligibility screening was provided.

Comments from the committee:

Jeff Owen noted the memo in the packet with screening results also including the last part about the bonding mechanism. Is this for discussion now or to be included in the following item? Mr. Leybold noted it's related to both but I can explain a bit now. The eligibility screening that we did was based on the factors outlined prior in the presentation. We are also looking at developing the mechanism by which we will do the bonding itself. We've done this in the past and TriMet has been the agency that has done the bonding five or six cycles now over the last 15 years or so. They have been the

agency that has worked that bond mechanism. What we have done at the regional table is dedicate that stream of revenue as a payment to pay off those bonds. There are a couple of bond options, and we are in discussion with TriMet about which of those might work best. They have to do with whether we could use a federal agency to help us with the bond process or whether we would do it with local money and do some fund exchange between local and federal dollars and then do the bond process locally. Those are essentially the options that we're looking at and what might work best with this next bonding cycle. And we are looking at the trade-offs of doing those. But they are fairly limited in terms of the number and scope of what we can actually do.

As we learn that information, we'll also bring that back to the table in terms of not just the project evaluation but what are the potential mechanisms and the trade-offs of those mechanisms. That will also feed into the discussion of how we might want to move forward with a bond option itself that we then take up in early fiscal or calendar year 2025. As we look at those different bond mechanism, they might have different eligibility requirements or limitations. That will all be brought forward in terms of those trade-offs and feeding into which bond option we would propose to proceed with or not proceed with.

Mr. Owen asked as discussions are happening about mechanisms did they reflect all the projects that are shown on the slide presented meeting eligibility. Mr. Leybold noted I think what you're asking is have we screened all the projects to necessarily meet all those eligibility requirements that might come along with the mechanism itself. That's no, there may be mechanisms that bring additional requirements along with them which could place some sort of limitations on what we fund with a particular project or the project itself. So that will be additional information we'll bring forward about the different mechanism options.

Mr. Owen asked is that the kind of target for our Dec. 6 TPAC meeting where there might be a report of that. Or would there be something ahead of Dec. 6? Mr. Leybold noted we're hoping to share that information on Dec. 6 in terms of what we know. We're still working hard to figure all of that out and flesh out options. We'll have a couple more meetings scheduled before the 6<sup>th</sup> and share what information we know at the Dec. 6 meeting.

Jay Higgins noted maybe I misunderstood some of the process for 1A but would like to learn more about the Better Bus program. The brief description we've seen sounds like the exact program we had before. I have concerns that it's a program going into this and not a specific project. Is it going to be clearer in the future? Are there more details to come? Mr. Leybold noted we'll share as much information as people want about the application itself. We are evaluating it and there are application materials that will be summarized when we come back. This will be covered in more detail in the next agenda item. We also have staff here who could also describe what the application says.

Mr. Higgins agreed it would be great to have more information. My big hangup is that it seems it's funding a program through the bond whereas all our programs are usually in 1A section. It appears to be moving forward without any consideration on that point being raised. Mr. Leybold noted I think at the last meeting there was indication that folks wanted to consider, as the bond option discussion progresses, of whether it would make sense to develop a Better Bus programmatic allocation in Step B. That's something that we will certainly talk about more as we discuss the allocation itself. But right now, we haven't started discussing options yet. We're still in the evaluation phase.

Eric Hesse asked if you were able to share a bit more around the Better Bus proposal. Seeing the language in the description of the submittal seems to be focused on the capital delivery of the pipeline. Given that there are ongoing workshops around the current process of Better Bus at least some entities are involved. Are you able to say more about how it might relate to that current process? Or is this intended to support a future round in the process?

Alex Oreschak noted I think Mr. Higgins described it pretty well. The bond application that was submitted for Better Bus would be a programmatic application. We don't have specific projects identified at this time for what that application would fund. It would be a continuation of the current Better Bus program. So, we would follow the same process that we did for this round of Better Bus, which was a workshop with partner agencies to identify areas of high transit delay and ridership, and where those partner agencies would have interest in implementing a Better Bus program to address that delay.

Mr. Hesse noted that to make sure if hearing correctly, as we're continuing to refine projects currently would it be available to fund some of the projects emerging from that now, say in the next year or two, given the timing of the bond concept. Or would it be another starting over of another round of application development. Mr. Oreschak noted it could be a combination of those. I think it would depend on when the bond funding was available and what projects we're able to fund with. We have \$5 million in construction funding for this round. So, there may be some that we can't fund this round that we still want to later. And there could be some that jurisdictions that aren't quite ready to implement yet, that we want to hold onto to be able to fund in the future round. It could be a little bit of both.

Jeff Owen noted thinking about that question about the program and what's in our packets and publicly available. A question or idea might be how you expect the next month ahead with the JPACT meeting and then the next TPAC meeting to perhaps be a window to share the next layer of a description of all of these that our county and many others have submitted with lots of information. That's a lot for your team to absorb and evaluate. But I think it sounds from that last question as well, maybe just sharing back out publicly a bit more about what each of these projects are asking for besides just the short description in that table. That might help to provide a touch more explanation without 50 pages each, but a bit more to the front end of what the nominations are.

Mr. Leybold agreed. We can look and see what might make sense in that regard. We want to share information, trying not to overwhelm folks. There's a lot out there so we'll try to balance what's helpful versus what's overwhelming with regards to both the bond process and the Step 2 process.

Chris Ford agreed. It would be helpful to get more details on all the applications. For instance, there's a 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project that at ODOT we are trying to understand exactly what this is. Does it influence Highway 99W or 217, or how does that fit in with the proposed SW quarter light rail project. There's a degree of we don't have any details on that project. To be able to know more about what's being proposed so we can know more whether we have any concerns, as an example. Other agencies may have similar things that we're going to need more information.

Maybe this will be part of a later process, but I think it would also be good to have performance metrics, some clear goals for which what each of the projects will need and is proposing to accomplish. We all know obstacles can come up and there can be inflation and it's common for scopes to change as realities get determined. This bond is pretty rare money. We want to make sure

that we get certain outcomes from it. And to make sure that any of these projects still need to meet certain metrics if they're going to get funded through the bond.

Dyami Valentine noted a comment was a follow up to Mr. Oreschak. I haven't been tracking the program closely but from what I understand there's kind of a cost sharing agreement for project delivery. Can you describe that because I'm assuming you would have a similar type of structure in place for if this program was to advance as part of the bond.

Alex Oreschak noted at the moment the Better Bus program is working on developing cost estimates for all the projects in the program. At that time, once we understand the full cost of the projects that we are looking to implement, and the amount of funding available, that's when we're going to identify what the specific cost sharing request is going to be. As one example in Washington County Cornell Road is a Better Bus project that I think we're interested in. The county's interested in discussing using the Better Bus program funds as a match for a grant application since that's a larger project that requires more resources than just the Better Bus program could provide. But there are others, some other smaller program projects that the program may be able to fund without a local match. It's a little dynamic and fluid right now but we're hoping to have more clarity in the next couple months.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Candidate Project Evaluation Framework (Noel Mickelberry, Metro) The committee was reminded of where we are in the process as we reach the evaluation of projects. The project evaluation includes meeting bond purpose and principles as directed by the criteria, showing meaningful impact toward RTP goals, and assessment for project readiness.

The evaluation framework was provided for individual projects and RTP goals regarding bond purpose and principles. The project delivery assessment will be conducted by an external consultant. Qualitative assessment of each project will be made through review of scope, schedule budget related to planning, partnerships and support, environmental considerations, preliminary engineering and design, and construction. The evaluation result ratings and narratives will be provided at the December TPAC meeting. Project evaluation, Bond scenario development and Recommendation, and Step 1A.1 and Step 2 Public Comment and Recommendations were outlined in next step timelines.

Comments from the committee:

Jeff Owen noted some of the nominations differ a little bit of what they are and not all exactly the same. With the measures that are proposed I'm asking for examples or statements to be included with projects in the pipeline. An example could be the Federal Transit Administration Capital Investment Grants, but not limited to that. It appears you are trying to choose some performance measures that could apply to the different types of nominations. How do you think some of those lean heavy towards high-capacity transit maybe more accessing transit. I'd be curious to learn more how you plan to evaluate different projects to advance transit ridership and access around the region even within a particular city or county. Different types of investments are very supportive of transit and meet a lot the goals and the outlines, even if they are not the same type of project. Another question is who might be evaluating the projects and will that team or approach include representation from across the region, across different communities within the Metro boundary.



Noel Mickelberry noted I think that's one of the biggest challenges with setting up an evaluation framework for different types of projects. A lot of that assessment will be qualitative in reviewing the materials that were submitted and trying to make some assessments. That's why there's going to be the narrative along with a rating because we don't want to leave it as a yes or no because there's a lot of contexts that we want to provide. With the CIG funding that's one component of leveraging funds but not the only consideration that we'll be looking at in applications. We will look at all factors and try to best understand where each project is, given the variety that we have.

To your second question at this point we were planning to have Metro staff review do this analysis. Part of it is a geospatial qualitative analysis, looking at where projects are and who they serve. Also, that qualitative piece which requires a lot of digging into the application materials and putting together that qualitative assessment with the intention, then the review of that and putting the scenarios together to bring back to you to gather the regional perspectives to put the scenarios together and build on what we're providing at that point. We're trying to have a team review and provide those rating and qualitative assessments along with the external review to provide to you by the December 6 meeting.

Mike McCarthy noted as it's been observed I think these are some very different types of projects and it's difficult to compare them all. We've got a couple bus rapid transit projects, streetcar extension, part of a big bridge replacement, some complete street projects, a program that doesn't have specific projects nominated, and then another kind of transit and road project to help both works better and safer. You can't really say one's better than the other. Any notion that we could somehow apply an objective scientific criterion that would then spit out which of these is the best and put them in order objectively, numerically, I think is ludicrous. I think there needs to be representation from a whole region about how these are evaluated and how they're discussed.

Ted Leybold noted that is why there is both quantitative and qualitative descriptions going on. Because not every project type is the same, but we do have good direction from the program direction that was adopted this summer in terms of what we're trying to achieve with these investments and the purpose of the bonding program itself that we can reflect on and say, how does each project match up against those. Sometimes it's quantitative, sometimes it's going to be qualitative. And there will be a description. I don't think it's ludicrous. We've done this before with the Step 2 projects. There's lots of different variety there, that we have an evaluation for. The evaluation itself will be the information upon which we will start the process in terms of a discussion about what makes sense to include in the bond and performances against those adopted objectives planning principles that were adopted. I think we'll do a good job of laying out that information out there. Having that evaluation across all projects by a group of professionals to look at I think we're laying out a good process for you to start from.

Eric Hesse appreciated the conversation. It was thought maybe folks were thinking of Step 2 evaluations in mind as this discussion unfolds. What I see in the memo and think I hear Mr. Leybold say is that it might be where some of those components you're presenting information and trying to summarize it in a way for JPACT and Council to look at for what do we get for the package. In the most recent Step 2 I recall there being some summary numbers, which sounds what I'm hearing some concerns about here. That suddenly we're going to roll up these numbers into a numeric rating, which I think does have some tension with the fact that there's a nice array of goals that have been called out. But how do you balance across which of those if we're not waiting and other things like that. Maybe if there's a way to compare it to which components of what we've seen before, will

that help ease some of the concerns at the table. Versus we're going to come up with a ranked order of projects.

Noel Mickelberry noted we'll be applying a rating to all of those measures and then bringing that back to you. There's not going to be a ranking of these projects scored high to low. It's not going to be a numerical ranking in order. It's bringing that information on each project and the rating for each of those measures for you to reflect on what you want to carry forward or recommended we carry forward as a priority versus a list of projects and how and what order we recommend they fall in.

Mr. Leybold added there will be a discussion in December about what thematic emphasis you want to have. Those thematic bond proposals will be informed by if you're emphasizing particular outcomes from the program direction that you want to emphasize, then things that will perform better in those areas that you want to emphasize might then be the priority projects that start the conversation in terms of what that bond option package is going to include. So, the discussion around the themes is also an important part of this next process that will also begin that conversation in December as well.

Mr. Hesse noted we recognize we're on a tight timeline and appreciate all the Metro staff's efforts to try to keep doing this. While I think trying to be as transparent and clear as possible about how we're shaping this, knowing that's challenging and that we just did a sprint to get you a bunch of information. I'm not sure I explicitly see it in the process in terms of maybe building confidence and understanding, would there be an opportunity to have some iteration around any of the ratings and some discussion around how those were established, if there were concerns for many of the nominating agencies around how things were rated.

I'm also wondering as I see some of the specific measures noted here, for example the Montgomery Park Streetcar, in terms of how we're benefiting residents with transit improvements in equity focus areas, which generally makes sense from an alignment with RTP goals, but also as we've discussed at this table in the past, there can sometimes be some nuance about how that's evaluated when you're dealing with a network that for example, the extension is in one area but connects to a bigger network and how folks are using it. I don't believe we gave specific information response to that. I'm wondering what other evaluation maybe particularly in some of those transit benefits is being done in terms of ride share and things like that versus here's where the thing is based and that would be the sole geographic analysis for the purposes of that evaluation, for example.

Ms. Mickelberry noted I think we'll do a little bit of assessment on where the project is located itself, but we also have a qualitative assessment of the engagement piece and what communities have shared about the project as well as being a critical component of this evaluation. I feel that we're trying to get at both of those components knowing that each project has impacts beyond its geographic location and trying not to only have that as the assessment here. We're definitely bring both of those forward in the best way we can because it's hard to assess that entirely with one way or the other. Mr. Hesse appreciated the comments. It was noted this is ongoing and to make it fair and equal to everyone if there are follow up questions or ways that we can provide more clarity on some of the modeling that's been done potentially, for example, stops or other things that might help look at rider areas to help inform, let us know.

Dyami Valentine noted I think that in the past rounds, especially for RFFA Step 2 process, there was this iterative process where there was a check in and how projects were being characterized and

framed. Making sure that there is that check in with the partners in terms of the story that is being told, I think would be appreciated for building off Mr. McCarthy's analogy. I'm assuming at the December meeting we will understand how big a bite we're consuming here. Is that part of that bond scenario discussion? Mr. Leybold agreed, that will be part of the discussion. I honestly can't guarantee we will have a good estimate at that December meeting. It depends on how these next couple of meetings go. I think I've said in the past what sort of the range we looked at. I'm hoping we can narrow that down a little by December, or maybe even targeted pretty narrowly.

Jeff Owen noted this variety of funding is highly hoped for and scrutinized, and everyone recognizes it's also just a small percent of what happens in the whole region. I think it's fair to overly simplify and characterize a little bit where past rounds of this kind of fund and the bonding potential historically have been used in a very successful manner. It has done a lot of great things around the region and it's exciting to have this opportunity to continue.

Referencing the program direction my understanding is that it is a continuation of success in the past and leveraging a lot of external money into our region. A little bit of a tweak for this cycle to keep making this process and opportunity more transparent and inclusive. We added a little bit in the last couple months to the eligibility and access to make sure that all parts of the region could see some benefits because even within a city or county or part of the region the investments being made to support transit and meet RTP goals can be a bit different. They don't all have to fit a certain definition. So, I thank you for working us through that and all the work involved with these funds.

Dyami Valentine noted I wanted to check in on the CFEC in the TPR there's a requirement that Metro adopts or makes sure some adjustments to its urban growth management functional plan by the end of the year. I wanted to see what the status of that was.

Kim Ellis noted that work is actually coming forward as part of the Urban Growth Management decision that Glen Hamburg has been working on with Ted Reid. From what I understand, and we can follow up more specifically, the functional plan will be amended to require local governments that have not yet adopted their 2040 center boundaries to do so by the end of 2025. There will still be another year for that work to happen. But the requirement in the CFEC rule (Climate Friendly Equitable Communities) will be addressed as part of that adoption action by the Metro Council. I will be coming back in January with more on this as well as the regional transportation planning work, the timeline for the functional work plan next year. We'll come back with more details thinking about that. But that work won't get underway until next year for the regional transportation functional plan.

Gerik Kransky asked again when we expect JPACT review and action on the CFEC item related to the functional plan. Ms. Ellis noted the Urban Growth Management Functional Plan amendments will not go to JPACT. Those have already gone through MTAC and MPAC process. MPAC has made their recommendation to the Metro Council and the council action is scheduled in December. When we begin updating the Regional Transportation Functional Plan, we will be working with TPAC, MTAC, MPAC and JPACT on that starting next year. We do not have a deadline or timeline for approval of those functional plan amendments. That's the region.

Just for context for everybody, there's an Urban Growth Management Functional Plan that Metro is responsible for and that directs local land use work, basically. The Natural Resource Protection under goal 5 and other aspects of implementation of the land use aspects of 2040 growth concept

implementation. And then we have a Regional Transportation Functional Plan which basically directs how cities and counties implement the Regional Transportation Plan. That has not been updated since 2012. That update needs to be refreshed. There's a lot of outdated references in there, but it will also need to reflect the new RTP that was adopted a year ago. And the new state CFEC rules in areas that it does not currently address. We'll give more of an update in January to help folks get grounded in all the different functional plans and the roles and the timing of it.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chair Kloster at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Marie Miller*

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, November 1, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	11/1/2024	11/1/2024 TPAC Agenda	110124T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	10/25/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 10/25/2024	110124T-02
3	2025 TPAC Work Program	10/23/2024	2025 TPAC Work Program as of 10/23/2024	110124T-03
4	Memo	10/22/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: TPAC Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Monthly Submitted Amendments: November 2024 Report	110124T-04
5	Memo	10/25/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 Next Steps	110124T-05
6	Draft Minutes	10/04/2024	Draft Minutes from TPAC October 4, 2024 meeting	110124T-06
7	Resolution No. 24-5443	N/A	Resolution 24-5443 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDING OR AMENDING, A TOTAL OF SIX PROJECTS TO THE 2024-27 MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS	110124T-07
8	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5443	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5443	110124T-08
9	Staff Report to Resolution 24-5443	10/24/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: November FFY 2025 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-54XX Approval Request – NV25-02-NOV	110124T-09
10	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1: Portland Streetcar Montgomery Park Extension	110124T-10
11	Attachment 2	N/A	Attachment 2: ODOT Key 23692 ADA Curbs and Ramps Site Location List	110124T-11
12	Memo	10/25/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 1A.1 – Eligibility Screening Results	110124T-12
Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee, Meeting Minutes from November 1, 2024				Page 13

13	Memo	10/25/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Noel Mickelberry, Senior Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 1A.1 – Bond Evaluation Framework	110124T-13
14	Handout	10/24/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 Project Delivery Assessment Overview TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM	110124T-14
15	Presentation	11/1/2024	Fatal Crashes Report	110124T-15
16	Presentation	11/1/2024	Today in the transit minute	110124T-16
17	Presentation	11/1/2024	November FFY 2025 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-5443	110124T-17
18	Presentation	11/1/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – New Project Bond Candidate Project Eligibility Screening	110124T-18
19	Presentation	11/1/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – New Project Bond Candidate Project Evaluation Framework	110124T-19