

Meeting minutes



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Meeting: **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC)**
Date/time: Friday, October 4, 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
Dyami Valentine
Judith Perez Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Lewis Lem
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Sara Westersund
Jasia Mosley
Katherine Kelly

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
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Port of Portland
Community member at large
The Street Trust
Oregon Walks
Community member at large
City of Vancouver

Alternates Attending

Karen Buehrig
Sarah Paulus
Francesca Jones
Dayna Webb
Will Farley
Gregg Snyder
Kate Lyman
Neelam Dorman
Jason Gibbens

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Lake Oswego and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Washington State Department of Transportation

Members Excused

Allison Boyd
Tara O'Brien
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy
Danielle Casey
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Multnomah County
TriMet
Washington State Department of Transportation
Verde
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Adam Torres
Anna Gore
Casey Gillespie
Cody Field
Dakota Meyer
Eve Nilenders
Frank Stevens
Henry Miller
Jeff Pazdalski
Jessica Engelmann
Jonathan Maus
Laura Terway
Max Nonnamaker
Miranda Seekins
Nick Fortey
Trevor Sleeman

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Alta
Oregon Department of Transportation
City of Tualatin
City of Troutdale
Multnomah County

City of Tigard
Westside Transportation Alliance
City of Beaverton
BikePortland
City of Happy Valley
Multnomah County
Washington County
Federal Highway Administration
Oregon Department of Transportation

Metro Staff Attending

Abigail Smith, Ally Holmqvist, Anthony Cabadas, Blake Perez, Caleb Winter, Eliot Rose, Grace Cho, Grace Stainback, Hanna Howsmon, Jai Daniels, Jaye Cromwell, Jessica Martin, John Mermin, Kadin Mangalik, Ken Lobeck, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Marne Duke, Matt Bihn, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krieger, Noel Mickelberry, 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

Updates from Chair

It was announced this meeting was the last TPAC meeting that Jaimie Lorenzini would be attending as the representative for Cities of Clackamas County. Ms. Lorenzini will be taking a new position soon. She thanked the committee for the pleasure of serving on this committee with a great group of friends. Many words of appreciation were shared on chat.

It was announced OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon has disbanded. Marianne Brisson who had been the TPAC community member for this organization, has left TPAC. Metro will look at next steps to fill this vacancy for community representative. Sarah Iannarone wanted to point out that with the loss of OPAL in the space it's going to be incumbent upon all of us to make sure that transit advocacy is held up in the interim. It was encouraged to keep all communications connected across our organizations. OPAL was a valuable connector in that space, and in their absence we're all going to have to do a bit more work until we figure out what's coming next in the advocacy space.

Updates from Committee Members

Jaimie Lorenzini noted the alternate members representing cities of Clackamas County will serve for a member position until final appointments are made. These are Will Farley from the City of Lake Oswego and Dayna Webb from the City of Oregon City. It was announced the job position has been posted for her former position with the City of Happy Valley. A link to the job posting was shared in

chat: <https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/happyvalleyor/jobs/4678248/management-policy-analyst-i?pagetype=jobOpportunitiesJobs>

Jeff Owen announced Clackamas County is hoping to soon release an RFP for a transportation system plan update. That will likely take us the bulk of calendars 2025 and 2026. It's a very big effort with a lot of focused interest. It will be an interesting time to get some help and making the comprehensive update. We welcome involvement and input from partners around the table and all throughout the county.

Dyami Valentine announced that Washington County is hiring for a limited duration senior planner position. This will be a two-year project focused position looking at annexation and special service district provisions in Washington County. It's different from the Governor's Action Plan. It predates that current activity. A link for this position was shared in chat:

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/cowashingtonor/jobs/4661257/senior-planner?page=3&pagetype=jobOpportunitiesJobs>

Sarah Iannarone noted ODOT's legislative road shows for the summer has wrapped up. There was a lot of support around the state for investments in Safe Routes to School Program, jurisdictional transfers, Great Streets, and transit investments, especially for our youth and elders. Amazing turnout on all of those fronts as well. And now we are headed into the period where the legislative work groups will begin. There will be three work groups, more back to basics, public and active transportation, and the commitments of House Bill 2017 and how we make sure we're making good on those. There are quite a few seats. So especially if you're not government affiliated in an organization and are looking to serve on one of those groups, there's going to be many hours of work involved, a lot of research, a lot of making sure that we're staying coordinated across those. If you want to talk about an opportunity to weigh in on any of those, please reach out to me.

On another front, I wanted to thank the City of Portland for scoping the cross-levy trail in helping us get that into the 2023 RTP update, because we were advanced in the Oregon Community Paths initial phase to try and go for some money for that, for the community of Parkrose, which we know has been historically underserved and seeking investments. Letters of support are welcome because it's critical and will be innovative to have the community leading on a project like this.

Gerik Kransky announced that the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality was successful with our \$200 million climate pollution reduction grant from EPA. The agency was expedited a handful of positions associated with that work. A new Climate Grant Coordinator, and Climate Investment Analyst. The Environmental Quality Commission recently adopted a new electric vehicle rebate program in Oregon. This is going to address the medium and heavy-duty vehicles. It's sort of a compliment to the existing light duty rebate program, and we're hiring a position to run that program as well. Links were shared on these opportunities in chat.

https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/en-US/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Portland--DEQ--Multnomah-Street/Medium-and-Heavy-Duty-Vehicle-Rebate-Coordinator--Program-Analyst-3-REQ-164399

Additional Job Opportunities with Oregon DEQ, Climate Investments Analyst:

https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Portland--DEQ--Multnomah-Street/Climate-Investments-Analyst--Natural-Resource-Specialist-4-REQ-165435

Climate Grant Coordinator:

https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Portland--DEQ--

[Multnomah-Street/Climate-Grant-Coordinator--Program-Analyst-4- REQ-166239](#)

Two Climate Grant Analysts: https://oregon.wd5.myworkdayjobs.com/en-US/SOR_External_Career_Site/job/Portland--DEQ--Multnomah-Street/Materials-Management-Climate-Grant-Analyst--Program-Analyst-2---Two-Openings REQ-163970

Ted Leybold announced his former position at Metro as Resource Development Manager has been posted. This position manages the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Travel Options, Safe Routes to School Program and Transportation System Management and Operations Program. Encouragement was given to either apply or let your networks know of the opportunity. A link was shared in chat:

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/oregonmetro/jobs/4665524/resource-development-manager?pagetype=jobOpportunitiesJobs>

Eric Hesse noted the City of Portland is looking for an Urban Freight Coordinator to ensure that goods movement in the city supports our goals for safety, climate, equity and access.

<https://www.governmentjobs.com/careers/portlandor/jobs/4648914/urban-freight-coordinator-iii-cppw-extended>

Upcoming Funding Opportunities from USDOT Chair Kloster noted the document in the packet with links to funding opportunities from USDOT, provided by Caleb Winter.

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:

- Hillsboro City Council: Adopted a Transportation Safety Action Plan on October 1, based on the Safe System approach with a 2035 Vision Zero target, safety recommendations and performance tracking. The adopted plan will be added to the City webpage soon – in the meantime review the final draft that was considered by the City Council Transportation Safety Action Plan | City of Hillsboro, OR (hillsboro-oregon.gov)
 - ODOT Transportation Safety: Produced new and educational videos in Spanish and English, increasing awareness of laws to “Stop Behind the (Bike) Box” and of the “Zipper Merge” onto freeways. See the videos here: [Bike Box English](#), [Bike Box Spanish](#), [Zipper Merge English](#), [Zipper Merge Spanish](#)
 - City of Portland: Repaving and adding safety improvements to NE Killingsworth St., from NE 53rd Ave. to NE Cully Blvd., including upgraded corner ramps, improved pedestrian crossings, a new median island, and parking protected bike lanes. [NE Killingsworth St Repaving and Safety Improvements](#)

Transit Minute (Ally Holmqvist) It was announced we had more than 6.5 million rides in our Metropolitan Statistical Area, about 4% more than this time last year and about 71% of pre pandemic ridership. Kudos were given to all the agencies for their hard work on continuing to make such great programs toward recovery. This month in our transit news segment the transit-oriented development in Wilsonville broke ground on a 121 affordable housing unit project. This project was a partnership funded by a Metro TOD grant, housing bond funds and other state funds. Many transit services at this location provide access to transit for residents. Multnomah County saw their highest ridership month yet with 4,753 rides across their free shuttles. TriMet and the City of Portland partnered again to provide signal transit priority at three intersections this time on Capital Highway saving riders up to 10 minutes each week.

Administrative Amendment to the 2024-25 UPWP for Regional Rails Future Study (John Mermin) It was noted that in the meeting packet there's a narrative and budget for a Regional Rail Future Study funded by the Oregon legislature. We are bringing this amendment into the upcoming United Planning Work Program (UPWP) fiscal year plan. Next steps will be sharing it with USDOT and ODOT for approval, and then reflecting these changes on our web page. Contact Mr. Mermin with any questions.

Public Communications on Agenda Items – none received

Consideration of TPAC Minutes from September 6, 2024 and TPAC workshop minutes from August 14, 2024
Motion to approve the minutes from September 6, 2024, and August 14, 2024 made by Chair Kloster.
Motion passed with one abstention on the September 6 minutes: Eric Hesse.

Metro Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 24-5434 Recommendation to JPACT Action Item (Ken Lobeck, Metro) The amendment bundle was described containing changes, updates, cancelations, and new project additions to a total of twelve projects.

Projects being canceled as part of the formal amendment bundle

I-405 Fremont Bridge (Willamette River) East & West Ramps (ODOT):

The project's summary scope of work is to inspect the paint condition on all approach ramps, develop a schedule of painting phases, repaint the highest priority ramps. Per OTC approval on August 1, 2024, the formal amendment cancels the project from the MTIP and STIP per approved Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) action during their August 2024 meeting. Prior obligated but unexpended funding has now been de-obligated in the FHWA Financial Management Information System (FMIS) allowing the project to be canceled from the MTIP and STIP. The de-obligated funds will be returned to the ODOT Bridge program.

I-205 Overcrossing (Sullivans Gulch) (Portland):

The project will provide safe access across I-205 for bicyclists and pedestrians by improving local street corridors on the west side of I-205 and constructing an east west bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing. However, a funding shortfall has arisen that PBOT can't resolve. Per discussions with ODOT, ODOT will allow PBOT to stop and cancel the project.

New projects being added to the MTIP as part of the October FFY 2025 Formal Amendment bundle:

Bus Replacement Program FFY 2020 5310 Portion - TriMet- FFY27 (ODOT PTD):

The formal amendment adds the new project to the MTIP and STIP. ODOT has allocated a portion of their FFY 2020 Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) appropriation to support elderly and disabled persons transit needs. The STBG originates from the FFY 2020 appropriation year. Once programmed, ODOT will initiate a fund flex transfer to FTA. This action transfers overall fund ownership from FHWA to FTA. The funds will be converted to FTA Section 5310 funds. TriMet then can submit a funding request to obligate and expend the funds in support of their elderly and disabled persons transit program needs.

Mass Transit Vehicle Replacement FFY25 TriMet (ODOT PTD):

The formal amendment adds the new replacement or right sizing bus purchase project to the MTIP and STIP. ODOT will complete the flex transfer of the SBG funds to FTA. The funds will be converted to FTA Section 5307 funding which TriMet will then be able to access to complete the replacement or sizing bus purchase.

Oregon Transportation Network - TriMet FFY25 (ODOT PTD):

ODOT's PTD awarded funding to TriMet supporting the 5310 enhanced mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities program for eligible 5310 capital projects (e.g., preventive maintenance,

purchase of service, mobility management and eligible capital asset acquisition).

Zero-Emission Buses Procurement and Powell Garage Upgrades (TriMet):

TriMet secured a \$39 million discretionary grant from FTA's Low and No-Emissions 5339c grant program. The funding will support the purchase of approximately 14 replacement articulated, 60-foot hydrogen Fuel Cell Electric Buses (FCEBs), update Powell garage maintenance bays, install a mobile fuel station to support the FCEBs operations, plus support workforce training needs.

SMART (SMART):

The formal amendment re-adds the former project Key 22191 now under 23741 for SMART in FFY 2025. The project will support replacement/rehab of buses and related amenities to include equipment such as ADA lift, technology components, and signs for customer service. A project carryover mistake occurred in the 2024-27 MTIP which is now being corrected.

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

Beaverton Downtown Loop: Phase 1 Demo (Beaverton):

The MTIP formal amendment adds the second Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS) award to the project. A Right-of-Way (ROW) and Utility Relocation (UR) phase also is being added. The project description is updated based needed clarity that the current project represents a segment of the overall larger Downtown Loop project. The changes result in the total programming amount for the project increasing from \$5 million to \$11.6 million

Willamette River: Stormwater Source Control improvements (ODOT).

The formal amendment adds the construction phase to the project. Funding will be transferred from the Statewide Bridge Program Construction Reserve. The updated construction phase cost estimate is \$29,900,000, The total programming amount increases to \$36,962,600. OTC approval is required for the amendment and is expected to occur during their October 2024 meeting.

Oregon Transportation Network - TriMet FFY27 (ODOT PTD):

The formal amendment completes a required authorized funding reduction for the project. Per a revised FTA allocation, the revised federal award decreases to \$1,700,000. The funding supports FTA Section 5310 elderly and disabled persons program needs. The funds are allocated to TriMet in support of their 5310 program. As with the other ODOT PTD STBG funded projects, ODOT will complete the flex transfer process to FTA to convert the funds to Section 5310 funding for TriMet to then access, obligate and expend through FTA's TrAMS grant system.

Oregon Transportation Network - TriMet FFY24 (ODOT PTD):

As with Key 23042, the formal amendment reduces the federal funding award from \$3,735,416 to \$1,487,934 per a revised FTA allocation. The committed State STBG for the project will be flex transferred to FTA and converted to FTA Section 5310 funds. TriMet will then access, obligate and expend the funds through FTAs' TrAMS system. The funding will be used to support FTA Section 5310 elderly and disabled persons transit needs. OTC approval was required for this amendment and occurred during their August 2024 meeting.

Columbia Zero Emissions Bus Operations Facility – TriMet (TriMet):

The formal amendment adds TriMet's new \$25 million Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) discretionary grant award to the Columbia ZEB Operations Facility project. The Columbia ZEB Ops Facility, TriMet's fourth bus base, will be a hub for powering and maintaining zero emissions buses and training operators, plus serve as fuel cell electric buses. The funding will help fund the design and construction of the facility which will also serve fuel cell buses.

Comments from the committee:

Sarah Iannarone appreciated all the hard work put into this. I was disappointed to see the Gateway area

bike ped infrastructure removed from the MTIP. When you look at about a \$3 million shortfall there, that's a rounding error when we're talking about improvements in that corridor. Initially the Abernathy Bridge in House Bill 2017 was supposed to be \$250 million. Then we double the price tag. Now it's up to \$662 million. And we still keep these projects moving forward. It's disappointing to see something as small as \$3 million stopping at a critical connection in a corridor.

We know congestion is a priority. We know it connects East County communities to critical services at either end. What we learned through our public engagement on the I-205 toll project through NEPA was that if we actually achieve our goals of being able to accurately price this corridor to manage demands, the impacts of that are going to drive more low-income communities and communities of color to public and active transportation options. We need to be making investments for the long term in bike ped infrastructure. We all know through our experience on this that any project deferred costs more down the road than it does now.

Eric Hesse shared Ms. Iannarone's disappointment because the City of Portland recognizes a critical connection within an area that needs better connections. We are frustrated with the situation in general including not having significant enough fundings as we dig hard and try to figure out which other projects to take it from. As you and other appreciate, when you've got various grant commitments and funding commitments you just can't start moving dollars around. That's part of the challenge too, to balance our budget every year as well. It's not the move we wanted to have to make but it felt like the right one now, including not being able to fulfill the grant obligations and needing to manage that as well.

I would also note some may have seen the Portland story, there's talk of returning the federal funds. And while that's true we have confirmation from ODOT that those funds will still remain committed to the region. They were STIP enhanced funds from that cycle. We are still continuing the conversation. I think with ODOT around what we may be able to do is try to find funding to advance other projects in the area underway that might continue to support long term connections. We realize that we need to continue to figure out how to get through what is a complicated and complex system of infrastructure. Between the important improvements of Better Bus, and the fact we're working with existing bridges and structures with the railroad thrown in made this challenging. I can't say exactly what the next piece is though we continue to actively pursue that interest.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted jumping back to the bridge cancellation project, you brought up that it was part of the annual STIP rebalance. But wasn't this particular project the product of the rebalancing needed from the loss of tolling revenue projected? It was canceling this project that prevented other projects in the STIP from being canceled?

Mr. Lobeck noted I can't tell you the exact origin, but it was part of the rebalancing. It started looking at base of loss of tolling and how does that impact other product. There were assumptions made based on the tolling revenues, where they would go, which freed up certain national highway performance program funds and the enhanced programs allowing them to be committed and move forward. So, when those were pulled out that deleted the safety net. What happened to the other projects just went through a difficult process ODOT started in early April and completed the first rebalancing review around June. Metro worked with them in July and August for a second cut look to decide what can they push out in the first attempt, be delayed, or push a project out and then back fill in later. As noted by Mr. Hesse the funds will stay in the region to support other funding needs as well.

Neelam Dorman noted that on the bridge painting project a similar answer to what Mr. Lobeck just said. It is part of this bigger OTC action to rebalance our funds. We're postponing the project, but based on our programming years, its whatever funds are available we'll try to bring it back and get it through. We had expended the PE phase, so we've done the preliminary engineering piece. And then there was about 11 ½ programmed for the construction piece. That will have to come back when OTC can identify the funds for it.

MOTION: To approve recommendation to JPACT to complete all required MTIP programming actions for the twelve projects in the October FFY 2025 MTIP Formal Amendment under resolution 24-5434.

Moved to approve: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Neelam Dorman

ACTION: Motion passed with two abstentions: Sarah Iannarone and Bill Beamer

Metro FFY 2024 Obligation Targets Performance Summary (Ken Lobeck, Metro) Mr. Lobeck reported on the obligation targets compliance that apply to three 3 Transportation Management Areas (TMA) programs. Metro must obligate at least 80% of our annual programmed Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Block Grant funds (STBG), and Transportation Alternatives (TA) funds. How this program works and consequences of not making targets was explained.

Overall, The FFY 2024 our obligation targets compliance has resulted in mixed results. The positive news is that for the fourth year, Metro will exceed our minimum 80% obligation targets requirement. This allows Metro to again participate in the annual Redistribution fund allocation with ODOT if ODOT secures Redistribution funds.

One the negative side, Metro's three-year obligation average is significantly declining. Some adjustments in how we review and evaluate future projects will be occurring for the FFY 2025 RYG Exercise cycle. The FFY 2024 delivery cycle presented a few unforeseen delivery barriers which we will have to better address for the future. Some of the adjustments are already occurring as part of the 2028-30 RFFA Funding Call in the form of application development support and post-award scoping and TSS form completion support.

Over the four years of obligation target compliance, we learned that our success or failure begins with the RFFA application and post award actions we complete. The better the RFFA application contains the necessary project details, and pre-scoping actions are accomplished, the faster the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) or Supplemental Project Authorization (SPA) can be developed and executed allowing project development or preliminary engineering to begin.

Comments from the committee:

Jeff Owen noted it was important to acknowledge the work by Metro, ODOT and partners for our region being able to have the redistribution of funds to add to projects that really need it. If we look at the chart on page 168 of the packet that shows year by year that percentage reducing from 100%. I think I hear you and your team are taking steps to keep that high through the RFFA program. Do you think those types of adjustments to the current cycle effectively pouring into the application process, those alone are a big piece of keeping that ration high? Or is that a small drop in the bucket for the overall obligation target percentage?

Mr. Lobeck noted I know if we scope better in the beginning it usually means the IGA or the Supplemental Project Authorization or Intergovernmental Agreement moves faster through the process without delay. We have some projects ongoing, one in year nine and still only 30% design

complete. We need to move faster and do better. We're trying to kickstart in the forward everything we can. Unsung heroes of this process are the delivery of sectional local agency liaisons to make sure everything moves forward. Other processes with ODOT will be worked on also.

Chair Kloster noted before ODOT had this program we had projects that had been funded and then languished for 10 to 12 years to a point where inflation overtook the ability to even begin to build the project. This is trying to get ahead of that problem with an incentive and we benefit if we get it right. Mr. Hesse appreciated Mr. Owen flagging the trend of lower percentages. It was noted we are on the cusp of having applications for the redistribution funds due to Metro shortly. We will want to make sure we're connecting the dots to meet those obligation targets and able to bring funds back to the region.

Community Connector Transit Study Introduction (Ally Holmqvist, Metro) Information on this study was shared. Community connector transit provides an opportunity to unlock more transportation access in the region and make transportation more equitable. This type of transit includes smaller, more nimble modes like shuttles, para-transit, micro transit, vanpools and other last mile transportation services (e.g., deviated route, on-demand) that are not local fixed route bus service. It often is more flexible than a bus – from going off-route to pick up or drop off riders to being by-request whenever needed (like Uber or Lyft). This flexibility can also help people travel to light rail or frequent bus routes that may stop a mile or more away from their home or destination. Right now there is a lot of regional momentum around community connector transit.

In anticipation of the 2028 RTP update, the work done as part of this study will build on recent transit planning efforts to explore community connector transit opportunities and determine the role it could play providing a service coverage solution as part of the local element of the transit spectrum within the vision. The CCT study will develop a strategy that sets a path forward for successfully achieving that vision toward supporting regional goals and provide a roadmap for leveraging and funding the identified opportunities.

This work will also develop tools and identify additional actions to support the local transit regional vision as part of a community connector transit strategy. That will include creating community connector transit, mobility hub/node and transit-supportive land use toolkits. It will look at potential alternative governance and financing models, and identify coordination needs and opportunities, and other actions for Metro, transit providers and local partners to take.

The CCT Study starts in Fall 2024 will be updated in four key phases, ending in Spring 2026. Staff will return to the working group, County coordinating committees, and Metro advisory committees and Council for input to inform each key study milestone. The timeline for this work aligns with scoping for the 2028 RTP that is anticipated to begin as early as late 2025.

Comments from the committee:

Jaimie Lorenzini asked as you start developing a system of where community connectors might make sense, how are you gauging where there might be latent demand for this type of service? Ms. Holmqvist noted we are early in the process, just getting this kicked off. Right now, we're a bit more in the inventory phase but we will be planning on doing that analysis once we get into the network assessment. I envision that we're going to use some of the criteria that we looked at for the high-capacity transit work but in a smaller way. Some of the same themes around land use to look at where people are. We'll be looking at ridership to know where people are traveling. I think that's

more to the latent demand where you're trying to get at where people are but might not have the potential to ride. And then the mobility data that we have around where we know that people are going. We'll pair that with other information getting to our regional goals like the equity areas. We can layer some lenses on top of each other. Those are initial ideas. We'll come back to talk about this more and get your feedback.

Mike McCarthy noted it seems like this could be a great opportunity for these smaller vehicles to coordinate with some of the affordable housing work as some of these affordable housing developments are opening and people are establishing their transportation habits. We could get this service to these housing areas before they might have all the metrics that TriMet would need for their normal service. Ms. Holmqvist agreed. We had that same thought, and I had a not to mention this in the presentation but skipped over it for time. But that was one thing we thought would be impactful. Thanks for mentioning that.

Sarah Iannarone appreciated the work with the study. It was noted the video shown in the presentation was part of the work the Street Trust did through the RTP engagement process. I wanted to thank you for doing compensated engagement, both for your nonprofit partners and the community. We were able to provide stipends to folks who participated. The statewide work we're doing now is uncompensated and the challenges of getting underrepresented voices to tables with the amount of time and prep that it takes is challenging. I want to congratulate both TriMet and Metro for investing in that.

Regarding the research questions you asked, one of the things that we're finding is getting the decision makers on the ground around the pinch points and the needs and having them connect with transit dependent folks in their everyday lived experience. Things like policy tours, study tours. We found this last summer, folks who usually drive probably don't understand what some of those connections and pinch points are like. Maybe even taking some of the committee members along with transit dependent folks as you're developing this, just to keep that practical experience in mind as you're planning this. We're doing some of that on the IBR engagement right now and finding it really helpful. Even when you're looking at a map it might be different if you're actually at that end of the network, end of the connector, edge of the network. We can really use the community's local knowledge to enhance your development of these ideas. Great job, thanks, and make sure you keep on keeping that community engaged because they help improve the outcomes.

Jeff Owen asked if more could be said about the few mentions on a first and last mile, thinking about gaps that do exist now around the region, Clackamas County and other areas as well. Could you clarify if you think this effort is going to focus in a little more on first mile gaps that people might have based on where they're living, or if it's going to be more focused on last mile that might be employment sites and other destinations, or if it's both. Just curious how you think that will unfold with the realization of gaps that do exist in the network now.

Ms. Holmqvist noted we envision looking at both. We have first and last mile outlined in our work plan. I will say that we want to look at that with some of the feasibility layers and elements or lenses as well. Looking at all those opportunities but also what's feasible from where and how these tools are most useful. It's also looking at this with a density lens and thinking about connections as well. We also don't want to limit it to first last mile but have other opportunity zones that are a little bit outside of that. That's something we're interested in exploring. Parks is one example where we envision that potentially maybe best being a first last mile. But there might be a different kind of

opportunity. We'll try to look to applying those different leuds around the feasibility and what we think would be reasonable.

Mr. Owen noted the mention of density as well. The tricky part all across the full spectrum of transit ridership, the more riders, the more efficient that service is going to measure out. But this is an opportunity to really focus on the gaps. Of what hasn't for decades been meeting the mark of what pencils in for a 40-foot bus on serving certain geography. I'm hopeful that this can. I understand that has to be a component of looking at density and number of rides and such, but this is also that unique opportunity to use different mechanisms or different size vehicles or different technologies to really try to help fill in those gaps.

Dyami Valentine was excited to see this launched. I see some real opportunities with this project to highlight some of the good work Washington County has been doing in partnership with Ride Connection. I like the suggestion about getting out in the community and would offer that opportunity taking advantage of some of the services that Ride Connection provides in Forest Grove or Tualatin. We're launching a new shuttle service in the Bethany area. We see this of right sizing the transit as a critical element in Washington County to provide access to the network and growing ridership. I wanted to ask and encourage thinking about a system and making sure this is really part of that system. I appreciate that was framed up in the high-capacity transit strategy. This is really part of the system. So, continuing to develop and evolve that rationale. I wanted to see how micro mobility might play into this study. Thinking about access to the network by other modes. You've mentioned mobility hubs but thinking about what that network looks like and how micro mobility, whether it's shared mobility or just general access, conditions might play into the study as well.

Ms. Holmqvist noted that's one of the reasons we moved away from one of the former names of this work when we had it called access to transit because we felt it was a little bit too active transportation related when really what we were looking at was more of the transit first last mile for micro mobility. Though, the one caveat is that when we do talk about mobility hubs, we do want to be a little broader and think about other connections and that would include the active transportation and then micro mobility opportunities. That would include be the point where we'd focus on that in tis work, where we're doing the assessment, where we're going to be more focused on the transit pieces. To clarify what micro mobility means, Ms. Holmqvist noted bike share and private modes of transit like Lyft and different shared opportunities for getting around.

Kate Lyman appreciated the leadership on this project and all the great work you're doing. It was asked if the project will include any element of cost estimating. I know you'll be developing recommendations which will help set the framework for the next RTP. I wonder if there will be any part of the project that will help the region understand scale of investment that will be needed to make these community connectors a reality.

Ms. Holmqvist noted we did talk a little bit in the scope, thinking about cost because cost effectiveness is something that we want to consider with these smaller capacity models. So, there will be a little bit of a focus on that, especially when we're also thinking about the feasibility of different areas. Local partners have done a lot more work to drill down to things and have a lot more expertise to drill down into routing and things like that. So, we're not planning on getting to that level in this work. We won't be able to be specific in any way about cost estimating. Cost is part of this in a consideration but we're not going to be planning on getting into a specific cost estimate level of work.

Eric Hesse appreciated the exciting work and appreciated colleagues noting that gaps that continue to exist, especially relative to some of the cost efficiency for fixed route and higher capacity routes. While we certainly acknowledge those around the region it would be remiss to not acknowledge there are those that remain in the City of Portland as well. Noting in particular the work done in our 2040 freight plan which recognized that in one particular access to our industrial areas for really important employment opportunities for middle wage jobs are an area we know is a real challenge. Good work has been done there to identify priorities and we look forward to bringing that work into the process to see if we might be able to continue to build on some of the success we've already had with some of the shuttles using STIF funding but need to expand that through a pretty expansive corridor along the Columbia and elsewhere.

Jeff Owen noted, just to plant an idea, if we're still early regarding cost estimates and such, maybe there's a way this report could at least help to provide transparency and summarize some of the costs that larger agencies like TriMet experience on a couple of typical fronts as well as the community connectors and contracted services.

A break in the meeting was taken.

Regional Transportation Demand Management Strategy Introduction (Noel Mickelberry & Grace Stainback, Metro) The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs was described to inform and encourages people to use walking, biking, rolling, transit and ridesharing to maximize the efficiency of the region's transportation system, leading to improved mobility, reduced traffic and lower carbon emissions. Public and private sector organizations dedicated to providing a better journey for everyone use TDM programs to provide people with transportation options that help them travel in affordable, efficient and sustainable ways. Different types of TDM programs include commuter transportation benefit programs, Safe Routes to School efforts and community-led encouragement/education events and activities.

The Regional Travel Options (RTO) program has been the region's primary TDM effort since the 1990s with a focus on reducing single occupancy vehicle trips in the region. The upcoming effort will be the first comprehensive Regional TDM Strategy, with the aim to develop shared goals and actions, and define roles among regional partners. The plan will ensure TDM programs are supporting regional mobility, climate and safety goals and are designed to be meaningful and appropriate based on specific context for different communities across the region. In addition, this process will include an update to the RTO Program Strategy to provide direction to the Metro RTO program about how best to support our local agency and community-based partners to ensure a coordinated and robust regional program.

Through the process of developing the 2023 Regional Transportation Plan, the region identified the need for clearer direction regarding how Transportation Demand Management should be coordinated and implemented. This direction more clearly describes the role of TDM in helping implement the region's strategies for mobility management and greenhouse gas emission reductions. New policy direction in the 2023 RTP includes new dedicated TDM policies and updates to the Regional Mobility Policy, which includes guidance for local agencies to integrate TDM into local Transportation System Plans and comprehensive plan amendments. The Regional TDM Strategy will include an implementation plan to meet this new regional policy direction.

The work of the Regional TDM Strategy will take place over the course of 18 months, kicking off in July 2024 with completion in December 2025. The project is broken into two phases:

Phase I: Assessment – Summer 2024-Winter 2025

- RTO Program Evaluation
- Regional TDM Needs Assessment

Phase II: TDM Strategy Development – January-December 2025

- Regional TDM Strategy
- RTO Program Strategy Update

Community and stakeholder engagement will occur throughout the course of the project, beginning with the Regional TDM Needs Assessment. Information on ways community and stakeholders will be involved was provided. The Regional TDM Strategy, and the accompanying RTO Program Strategy Update, will be brought back to TPAC, JPACT & Metro Council for adoption in fall 2025.

Implementation will occur directly following adoption with integration of recommendations informing the FY 2027-2029 RTO competitive grant solicitation that will open in January 2026.

Several resources were shared with the committee:

<https://www.oregonmetro.gov/local-transportation-system-plans>

November 13th TDM/TSMO System Completeness Guidance Info Session:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZwkdOitqzMpHtUEmFHDpPYLzFqrCEPyrVt#/registration>

TDM/RTO practitioners workshop on November 7th:

https://oregonmetro.wufoo.com/forms/sqffg9i098c2tk/?utm_source=hs_email&utm_medium=email&hsenc=p2ANqtz-

[8EBEVKTe1R77HydMJnPWgFpDnRnh59EZjSL7EJlghmKkvL950Bjokbk5hfagJ3_P7wKM6o](https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/regional-transportation-demand-management-strategy)

TDM Strategy webpage - sign up for updates: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/public-projects/regional-transportation-demand-management-strategy>

Comments from the committee:

Jeff Owen asked if you could help clarify a bit more how work from home, hybrid workforce and flexible schedules with different employers with different targets for return to offices for work factor into this work underway. It seems that on the one hand we have a very different mobility system than we did just a few years ago. On the other hand, it also seems like traffic is normal again.

Ms. Mickelberry noted we recognize that's a big shift that's happened and our programs need to adapt to recognize that. That's a big reason why we're taking this all-trips approach. Because we recognize that the trips folks are taking are different and are often at different times of the day or for different needs. And they may make different decisions if they're not commuting to work. Even if they did commute to work by transit before and stopped on their way to pick up groceries, they may do this now in the middle of the day.

Those are some of the things we'll be looking at in the needs assessment. We'll take some of the data gathered from our RTO evaluation that looks at some of those shifts and try to identify opportunities and how we can address that. There will be cross collaboration between the commute program and our community focus as well as Safe Routes to School program. We know parents taking children to school is still a trip many families are taking and may have shifted if working from home. We'll pull all those pieces together as we come up with strategies and activities that meet needs now. And part of the reason why we are jumping into this is our 2018 strategy was supposed

to be for 10 years, but things have changed. We want to address that through our programming.

Eric Hesse noted building on the important role Metro has already played in this area, especially as we grapple with investment challenges, an important focus on these relatively low-cost approaches that can help continue to get the most out of our existing capacity and meet our goals regionally. I appreciate you are framing the geographic variability in the region and thinking through the context sensitivity. That's really important. Recognizing that even if it's lower cost than maybe major capital projects, it's still we don't have all that much money. We need to be thoughtful about where we make investments in ways that can capitalize on where those options exist, but also do that context sensitively.

I appreciate the linkage to regional mobility policy and how we're continuing to think through RTP implementation in addition to that important linkage. I wanted to highlight for those of us going through RTP updates in the near terms that there are also under the Climate Friendly Equitable Communities rules or the updated transportation planning rule requirements for transportation options planning as well. I encourage us to be thoughtful about how we might be able to use the regional needs assessment in partnership with the jurisdictions engaging to think through that and how we help define that. I see some real opportunity for our region to do that collectively in ways that can help the state see that we have a clear vision and consistent message, information and strategy.

Some of the work the City of Portland has done on our TDM strategy that we framed under the way to go plan calls out the centering of climate equity as we think about TDM strategies. A link in chat was shared: <https://www.portland.gov/transportation/walking-biking-transit-safety/waytogoplan>

Mike McCarthy noted you mentioned specific areas that we'd like to see explored and I'd like to see this work look into some of the longer distance commutes to and from the Portland region. Working for Tualatin we just found some data from our TSP. We have about 30,000 workers a day coming into Tualatin, and about 10,000 of those are from outside the Metro area. It seems like there's a real opening there for people who explore travel options and things like carpooling or van pools, or things like that to help.

Ms. Mickelberry noted I think that's one benefit of this being a regional plan versus just a Metro specific because our funding is a little limited in going towards programs that are outside of the Metro region. As we're thinking of a regional strategy, we can identify those needs and especially say we need funding and programming that does cross the boundaries of what our program can serve. Vanpool is one of those examples. Through our racial equity strategy, we've heard a lot about shuttle needs to reach the edges of the region. Coordinating with Ms. Holmqvist's work and statewide work that can cross those boundaries is going to be really important.

Chair Kloster added we're starting to put together information on our expanded planning area for federal purposes, which now reaches well in Marion County. This is where there is the Metro boundary, the state planning requirements, and then this federal layer. We'll be coming back to talk about that.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted I'll preface my comments by saying I am much less familiar with the TDM side of the equation. But from what I know it's an amazing tool for built facilities. As we go through this study, I don't want to lose sight that TDM may not always be the appropriate solution. Sometimes

we need to build a new facility because we have an underbuilt system. In all cases we should be managing our facilities effectively. Are you able at this point to forecast potential ramifications or takeaways for the 2028 RTP update? My concern is as we build out this local toolbox of TDM and what it means for our region I want our toolbox to be something that local governments can go to create context sensitive outcomes without placing a one size fits all requirement on facilities. Because not every facility will be able to support a certain type of TDM. How do we keep that local flexibility?

Grace Stainback noted one of the resources that we're working on in support of the guidance for local planners in terms of making sense of the regional mobility policy update and those kind of elevated requirements for including TDM and TSPs and identifying solutions, we are working on a toolbox of TDM and TSMA strategies that locals can consider. I think the big disclaimer that you'll find in our guidance which is very much also reflective of the updated state level TSP guidelines, per CFEC. So much in line with what's being asked of folks at the state level essentially identify needs, documenting gaps, setting priorities.

The overwhelming disclaimer in our guidance as well as in the toolbox of example strategies that we're working to provide as an additional resource to folks is that TDM always needs to be tailored to local context and needs. It's something that we recognize as a program and as practice leaders there's no one size fits all approach. It's very much an array of policies and programs and light infrastructure and education and initiatives that very much need to be responsive to what the realities are for the local transportation network and the needs of the communities and folks that are traveling there. That's something that we recognize and encourage folks who apply in their work that I think we would never be recommending a one size fits all approach to applying TDM.

Kate Lyman asked if you could talk about how this work relates to regional conversations relating to roadway pricing, parking management, and parking pricing policies. Ms. Mickelberry noted we touch on it very lightly in the diagram on page one that talks about the community connector study and then complimentary policies and programs. The way TDM is defined in the RTP is separate from parking and pricing, although we know those are also very impactful activities that change travel behavior. So, we're leaving those as they are in the RTP as separate but complimentary efforts that we're going to be coordinating closely with. That's not what's going to be reflected in the TDM strategy itself. We're keeping it within the box that the RTP defines but want to recognize that those are really important and related efforts, much like the work Ms. Holmqvist is doing on first last mile and shuttle work.

Sarah Iannarone wanted to flag two elements that we've just encountered in our work that might be helpful in this. One, it's week without driving here and many on the vanguard of that action are the folks who can't afford to drive or don't. We learn a lot from our car free neighbors about what works and what doesn't in TDM because they practice it every day as we're trying to education other people in that. To the extent we can learn from, especially the policymaker focuses on that, the Street Trust did a dedicated educational program through our policy maker candidate school because there are so many people running for office in the City of Portland this time. We put 50 of those candidates through our transportation school. The lack of basic information about principles related to TDM among that population, again, that's a small subset, but we had a good end in that classroom setting.

We might want to think about decision maker education on TDM as well as the public side because

the system users know a lot about it but the decision makers and the people who control plans and budgets sometime have less complete information around TDM principles and practices. Getting that information out could be critical to advancing this.

The other aspect of it that we've been leaning into and exploring, just in the pilot phases, but we just picked up another transportation funding to launch another round on our e-Bike Ride to Win program. That's been a pretty strategic partnership and we've leveraged a lot of opportunities on that, including educational funding from Metro as well as partnership with community groups, PGE and local manufacturers. So definitely don't sleep on exploring the power of strategic partnerships in our region and how we might be able to grow our program through that as well. We're happy to share any data or feedback.

Gregg Snyder noted seeing the reference to the mobility policy and the regional mobility policy. As I understand it, we placed it somewhat on hold until the regional functional transportation plan update. I know there's going to be a lot of input on the regional mobility policy. I wonder why we're splitting a portion of it off to be studied in this project and not bundled with that. It's very similar to what you've just described. Ms. Holmqvist is doing a community connector project that's very similar to what you are looking at, very complimentary, but it's still two processes. If we want to have a complete community connector and our TDM system, we have to participate in two different processes for the whole thing. Is the intention really to split off a certain portion of the mobility policy here, this TDM relationship and study it in your project? Or is it going to be lumped with the mobility policy as a whole? I'd like some clarification where we should be focusing if we want to work on the mobility policy holistically.

Grace Stainback noted this project is very much an entirely separate effort from the regional mobility policy. I just mentioned it as an adjacent effort in that the regional mobility policy did include considerations for TDM that we want to make sure that we're honoring as part of this project process. We acknowledge much implementation work still needs to be done to fully apply that via the regional transportation functional plan.

Ms. Mickelberry added we're a little bit different, early in providing some guidance, but that's partially because the TDM system completeness is brand new. We've been working on the website, and interim guidance because we know there's more work to be done. At this point we're looking to hear from folks on what additional support they might need. Overall, TDM and RTO work has been pretty separate from the TSP planning world. We're just trying to make sure we're connecting the dots and hearing from folks about what support Metro could provide as part of this process. It's more of an information gathering part of the phase or part of the project as it relates to existing tools and guidance that we're working on developing.

Chair Kloster added both this project, and especially Ms. Holmqvist's because it's very much driven by the regional transportation plan, are going to tee up things for us to carry forward into the regional transportation plan and the next update. You mentioned the regional transportation functional plan. For folks not plugged into that, that is the plan that essentially lays out and oversees counties, things that need to comply with the regional level in your local transportation system planning. What I see unfolding here is we have a mobility policy just adopted last November in the new regional transportation plan. I don't see these efforts changing that policy, but they could inform the functional plan update that's coming. I'll pass this forward to Kim Ellis who has created a chart of different plans that are flowing parallel that need to come together. It's complex. Our goal is

always to minimize the pain for everybody involved. But between federal regulations that affect us on the transportation demand management, on of the required steps we go through anytime we talk about capacity, that's a federal requirement, but we now have at the state level even more administrative roles to work into our planning. So, it's complicated, but that said, I'll pass it along to Ms. Ellis because I want to make sure we're acknowledging that. We'll make sure we're talking about how these pieces all flow together. The goal is not to have things happening in a vacuum or on tracks that aren't coordinated. It's really to pull it all together. Mr. Snyder added if we're going to concentrate our focus on that mobility policy and how it's implemented, we want to do that in one project and not in two or three of them. That would be most helpful.

Eric Hesse thanked Ms. Lyman for raising the question around pricing. We'd be remiss in not noting that, appreciating Ms. Mickleberry's response around how the RTP is structured, and recognize that's informing the work plan at Metro. I flagged the City of Portland's way to go plan earlier. We included pricing in that in part because some of the work we've done with ODOT and Metro informing the last RTP and other work showed that pricing was by far one of the most effective means not to undermine the other pieces, but the interactions of those where we see the most change on the ground toward our goals. As we move forward in the next cycle of the RTP updates we really do keep that portion of the conversation going even as the state has paused some immediate actions but for us to continue to understand how those important dynamics interact which are going to be crucial for our success and meeting our ambitious goals. Acknowledgement was given to the work of the Street Trust on meeting the challenges with affordability and staying informed by live experience.

Chair Kloster noted a chart is being developed that tie together these different efforts. Kim Ellis will be contacted to bring this to TPAC soon to walk through it with everyone. It helps to map out the full picture of projects and timelines.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Next Steps and Eligibility Screening Criteria (Grace Cho, Metro) The presentation provided an overview of the next steps in the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 – New Project Bond development process (with schedule) and shared the criteria in use as part of eligibility screening for the bond project nominations. In total, 10 nominations were received. An eligibility screen process is underway for all bond project nominations received. The purpose of screening the bond nominations is to verify and ensure that the nominated projects meet the necessary eligibility requirements applicable to all projects and those additional eligibility requirements specified for certain transit project categories.

The screening ensures nominated projects moving forward meet the necessary eligibility requirements because of the various considerations, including, but not limited to: federal funding requirements, project delivery through the federal aid process requirements, regional directives, bond mechanism, and elevated deliberation of implementation schedule as a bond would advance monies today at the expense of future Regional Flexible Funds. Additional eligibility factors may result from the bond mechanism determined for building a bond proposal around and the financial analysis.

Following the completion of the screening of bond nominated projects, those nominations which continue forward in the bond development process will undergo a candidate project evaluation. The evaluation has three components: 1) Bond purpose and principles consistency and advancement; 2) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals advancement; and 3) Project delivery

assessment. Nominating agencies with candidate projects moving forward in the bond development process will be asked to submit additional follow-up data to support the evaluation.

At the November 1st TPAC meeting, Metro staff will outline the final candidate project evaluation framework, evaluation measures, and the schedule. The candidate project evaluation results are tentatively scheduled for presentation at the December 6th TPAC meeting and the December 19th JPACT meetings. Near-term next steps in the bond development process and activities were shared.

Comments from the committee:

Jeff Owen noted as we look ahead, not that it's October and moving into the next JPACT meeting, packets come out ahead of schedule with as much information as possible. How much content can we expect in the packet approaching the 17th versus discussion during JPACT on the 17th for all of us that have potential nominations that are being evaluated. I just want to be clear that we all understand what might be coming ahead of the 17th versus on the 17th.

Ms. Cho noted the bond development process is not an agenda item currently on the October 17 JPACT meeting. It's a comment from the chair at this point, so likely to be announcing that a memo has been issued and the results from the eligibility screening has been completed and it's available for review. At this time, it's not specifically going to be a discussion item at JPACT. In terms of where we are in trying to complete our review and get clarifications, we'll probably need every minute up to the 17th.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted building on comments about the October 17 date, I know the data request goes out on the 17th, and it's due the 24th. When we talk about a data request are you talking about needing to clarify parts of their application or needing to submit GIS data to supplement? Ms. Cho noted we've already made a GIS data request specifically to all the applicants at this point specific to the bond. This would be specific to those projects that were deemed eligible moving forward. There would probably be a questionnaire that we're asking for the applicants to complete and fill out that would be asking for further detail about their project nominations in terms of their development process or expenditure schedule. The aim is to provide a uniform questionnaire to make sure we've fully captured the necessary information to move into candidate evaluation. This is lessons learned from this process since we haven't done this before and more time to provide instruction on how we're looking for responses to the application.

Ms. Lorenzini noted that with the tight turnaround and knowing some of these agencies that have submitted I wonder if it might not be helpful, particularly for the smaller jurisdictions, if a rough draft of the questionnaire could go out ahead of the 17th so they could start preparing the type of information you need to help you hit that October 24 deadline.

I appreciate getting to see the Step One projects that have been submitted as candidates. Looking at those projects I noticed that there are two classes of projects that we're seeing. One is projects that have a specific location, and the other one is an outlying programmatic proposal around Better Bus. How will you compare a programmatic investment versus a project investment for the purposes of an evaluation?

Ms. Cho noted you are mentioning one of the questions that we're running into internally as we're working towards the development of that project evaluation framework moving forward with the bond. The interesting thing about the Better Bus application is that it does complete capital projects

in terms of its investment toward transit vehicle priority through the transit network. I think there are some different thoughts and approaches that we might be applying in terms of what are the potential candidates that are in line as it relates to Better Bus. One approach could be we look at the lens of the evaluation, but at this point we're still in the process of making that decision. The most I can tell you at this point is that we're in discussions of how we look to evaluate that.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted that recognizing that Metro staff is a submitter to the Step One bond, how is Metro remaining objective in the evaluation process? Ms. Cho noted I want to first recognize that this is not the first time that a part of Metro has applied for Regional Flexible Funds. There have been times where we've had Metro applications come in the Step 2 process. The Better Bus program is actually a completely different division section of the staff that work on the MTIP as well as work on the RFFA. There is already an internal division as it relates to that process. We are taking it through the same eligibility rigor and asking a lot of the same questions or applying the same criteria that we would as if this was a nomination coming from any other agency.

I understand and hear where that concern is coming from. I think it would be more challenging if this was something closer into our RFFA process and keeping an objective eye on our review of the application. Right now, we're primarily looking at the eligibility, meeting federal requirement and able to move on into the next candidate evaluation phase. Ms. Lorenzini added I wonder if it might not make sense to tap the consultant to be the one to evaluate the Metro applications purely to help protect Metro staff, even though I know you're all doing your best, but things get rougher toward the end of the process.

Gregg Snyder noted you're funding competition that's supported by JPACT. I don't know how the optics look good if scoring your own application. You could have had another agency sponsor it. We were asked to come up with a GIS file. It's a point location, a point on the map, a rectangular corridor. I'd like to see the GIS locations on your Better Bus project application. Do they have the defined project list that can be evaluated for construction? In the application is there a list of subprojects that's been identified, scoped, funding with local match with implementation? If we know in the bond program that we could produce a program and not a project we might have approached things differently. I think it fits better in Step One B which is the programmatic approach for all kinds of things that Metro's doing like TOD with Better Buses in there. If we want to expand Better Bus, it seems like the optimum piece is in the Step One B conversation. Overall, I like the 10 projects and think the list assembled is going to serve very far in the future.

Ms. Cho noted programmatic applications were not ineligible. I don't think anyone was thinking about programmatic applications as part of the bond process but that it wasn't a barrier. When the Metro team had decided to put in an application for it, based off the requirements that we laid out, that would not have prevented it from the team putting in an application. We would have considered a programmatic application from any of the regional partners as long as it met the eligibility requirements that we were outlining with that. It is a programmatic requested investment. It is not part of our Step One B set of programs.

Better Bus was born from the last bonding effort that occurred in this region. So, to a certain extent it's not a surprise that it was seeking the same funding source that supported it previously. I'm glad it's raising interest questions that regional partners are considering as the nomination itself is a bit unique. Maybe it has a different place than it needs to be. We have made a decision with our program direction as it relates to solidifying the Step One B allocations at this point. But if as a region

there is a desire to have a discussion about Better Bus in terms of an allocation to that as either a current or future Step One B allocation, I think that would be a recommendation or comment the region can entertain.

Mike McCarthy thanked Mr. Snyder and Ms. Lorenzini for bringing up some good issues. I want to echo Ms. Lorenzini's request for a little longer time, or even just getting the draft question out between October 17 and the 24th deadline.

Jay Higgins agreed with a lot of what Mr. Snyder and Ms. Lorenzini have brought up. I hear the defense, but I think there's definitely more that should be poked at with the concept. We've done some interestingly good work with the program, but none of those led to actual online construction and that was definitely how the bond is.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted hearing everyone's comments I understand we're under a very tight timeline and that is incredibly difficult. It would put the question back to Ms. Cho, do you need to be successful in the process and how can the regional partners come alongside to help make this as smooth a transition as possible over the next couple weeks.

Dyami Valentine appreciated the comments and we're certainly here to support you. We have our work ahead of us because this is an ambitious list and I think as Mr. Snyder noted, it will serve us well moving forward regardless of what we end up selecting for the bond effort. My comment is more how the projects are being characterized in the table. Super minor comment but wanted to note in terms of the sub-regional classification I was going to suggest that 82nd Avenue be reclassified as a Multnomah County and Clackamas County sub-regional benefit. And the 72nd Avenue as it is regional, suggest maybe that's our Washington County sub-regional project.

Adjournment

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, October 4, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	10/4/2024	10/4/2024 TPAC Agenda	100424T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	9/24/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 9/24/2024	100424T-02
3	2025 TPAC Work Program	9/24/2024	2025 TPAC Work Program as of 9/24/2024	100424T-03
4	Handout	N/A	Upcoming Funding Opportunities from USDOT	100424T-04
5	Memo	9/27/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Administrative amendment to the 2024-25 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for Regional Rail Futures Study	100424T-05
6	Draft Minutes	9/6/2024	Draft Minutes from TPAC September 6, 2024 meeting	100424T-06
7	Draft Minutes	8/14/2024	Draft Minutes from TPAC August 14, 2024 workshop meeting	100424T-07
8	RESOLUTION NO. 24-5434	N/A	Resolution 24-5434 FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING, CANCELING, OR ADDING A TOTAL OF TWELVE PROJECTS TO THE 2024-27 MTIP TO MEET FEDERAL PROJECT DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS.	100424T-08
9	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5434	N/A	Exhibit A to Resolution 24-5434	100424T-09
10	Staff Report to Resolution 24-5434	9/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: October FFY 2025 MTIP Formal Amendment & Resolution 24-5434 Approval Request – OC25-01-OCT	100424T-10
11	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1: OTC August 2024 Meeting - 2024 Annual STIP Amendment Item	100424T-11
12	Memo	9/26/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ken Lobeck, Metro Funding Programs Lead RE: Metro FFY 2024 Obligation Targets Compliance Summary	100424T-12
13	Memo	9/27/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Ally Holmqvist, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Introduction to the Community Connector Transit Study	100424T-13

14	Attachment 1	June 2022	Attachment 1: Public Transit 101 Fact Sheet	100424T-14
15	Attachment 2	July 2024	Attachment 2: Community Connector Transit Study Fact Sheet	100424T-15
16	Attachment 3	N/A	Attachment 3: Community Connector Transit Study Work Plan	100424T-16
17	Attachment 4	October 1, 2024	Attachment 4: Community Connector Transit Study: Working Group #1 Agenda	100424T-17
18	Attachment 5	September 2024	Attachment 5: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLAN Community Connector Transit Study	100424T-18
19	Attachment 6	September 2024	Attachment 6: REGIONAL TRANSIT FEEDBACK SUMMARY	100424T-19
20	Memo	9/27/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Noel Mickelberry, RTO School & Community Travel Options Coordinator Grace Stainback, RTO Grant Program & Evaluation Coordinator RE: Regional Transportation Demand Management Strategy Introduction	100424T-20
21	Memo	9/27/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 1A.1 – Eligibility Screening Criteria & Next Steps	100424T-21
22	Attachment 1	N/A	Attachment 1: 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund - Step 1A.1 - Nominations Eligibility Screening	100424T-22
23	Presentation	10/4/2024	Fatal crashes update for September 2024	100424T-23
24	Presentation	10/4/2024	Transit Minute	100424T-24
25	Presentation	10/4/2024	October FFY 2025 Formal MTIP Amendment Resolution 24-5434	100424T-25
26	Presentation	10/4/2024	Metro FFY 2024 Obligation Targets Performance Summary	100424T-26
27	Presentation	10/4/2024	Community Connector Transit Study	100424T-27

28	Presentation	10/4/2024	Regional Transportation Demand Management Strategy Introduction	100424T-28
29	Presentation	10/4/2024	2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) – Bond Nominations Eligibility Screening Overview & Next Steps	100424T-29