



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Wednesday, August 14, 2024 | 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Place: Virtual online meeting via Web/Conference call (Zoom)

Members Attending

Ted Leybold, Vice Chair
Judith Perez Keniston
Eric Hesse
Jaimie Lorenzini
Jay Higgins
Mike McCarthy
Laurie Lebowsky-Young
Bill Beamer
Sarah Iannarone
Jasia Mosley
Katherine Kelly

Affiliate

Metro
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Portland
City of Happy Valley & Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham & Cities of Multnomah County
City of Tualatin & Cities of Washington County
Washington State Department of Transportation
Community Member at Large
The Street Trust
Community Member
City of Vancouver

Alternates Attending

Sarah Paulus
Will Farley
Dakota Meyer
Gregg Snyder
Glen Bolen

Affiliate

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

Members Excused

Karen Buehrig
Allison Boyd
Dyami Valentine
Tara O'Brien
Chris Ford
Gerik Kransky
Lewis Lem
Marianne Brisson
Sara Westersund
Indi Namkoong
Ashley Bryers
Steve Gallup
Shawn M. Donaghy
Danielle Casey
Shauna Hanisch-Kirkbride

Affiliate

Clackamas County
Multnomah County
Washington County
TriMet
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Port of Portland
OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon
Oregon Walks
Verde
Federal Highway Administration
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Adam Torres
 Andrew Mortensen
 Anthony DeSimone
 CJ Doxsee
 Henry Miller
 Ian Matthews
 Jane Black
 Jean Senechal Biggs
 Jeff Owen
 Jessica Horning
 Kathryn Doherty-Chapman
 Leilani Garcia
 Miranda Seekins
 Nick Gross
 Randall Olsen
 Russ Doubleday
 Shelley Oylear
 Tanya Battye
 Tiffany Gehrike
 One unidentified attendee

Affiliate

Clackamas County
 David Evans & Associates
 Clackamas County
 Washington County
 City of Tigard
 Oregon Department of Transportation
 TriMet
 City of Beaverton
 Clackamas County
 Oregon Parks & Recreation
 Portland Bureau of Transportation
 Tualatin Hills Parks & Recreation District
 Washington County
 Kittelson & Associates
 City of King City
 Kittelson & Associates
 Washington County
 City of Milwaukie
 City of Tigard

Metro Staff Attending

Ally Holmqvist, Dan Kaempff, Grace Cho, Jake Lovell, Jeremy KC, Kate Gregory, Ken Lobeck, Lake McTighe, Marie Miller, Matthew Hampton, Monica Krueger, Noel Mickelberry, Ted Leybold

Call to Order and Introductions

Vice Chair Leybold called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Introductions were made. Reminders where Zoom features were found online was reviewed.

Comments from the Chair and Committee Members - none received

Public Communications on Agenda Items - none received

Consideration of TPAC workshop summary, June 12, 2024 (Vice Chair Leybold) The committee was asked to send edits to Marie Miller. With none received the summary as approved as written.

2028-30 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) Proposers Workshop Part 1 (Grace Cho/Ted Leybold, Metro) The presentation began with a review of what the regional flexible funds were, the allocation program direction and allocation structure. The 2028-2030 RFFA Step 2 Pre-Application Process was reviewed. New to Step 2 this cycle is the pre-application letter of intent. Elements to this were described:

- Letter of Intent to Apply required for Step 2
 - General information on who's applying
 - Non-binding list of project applications for submission
 - Template Letter of Intent available
- Pre-application instructions: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/publicprojects/2028-30-regional-flexible-fundingallocation>

Letter of Intent to include:

- Candidate project(s) name
 - OK – Multiple projects on the Letter of Intent
 - No penalties for including more projects than submitted.
- Estimated amount & requested Regional Flexible Funds
- Project development only OR construction funding
- Application assistance consideration (if requesting)

Summary of Letter(s) of Intent received by September 6th.

Also new to Step 2 is application assistance - Consultant support for reviewing and developing Step 2 project applications.

- Request application assistance through Letter of Intent during pre-application period
- Letter of Intent template includes assistance placeholder
- All agencies eligible for application support

Notifications sent by August 30th.

Assistance available by tiers:

- Tier I – Application review
- Tier II – Application development and support
- Eligible applicants divided by tiers
- Based on size, staff capacity, federal aid expertise

Selection process if requests exceed resources.

Projected available funding for RFFA Step 2 is \$47-\$60 million. Funding details and requests were reviewed. Eligible project types were defined. Other factors to consider for applying for Step 2 funding:

- Federal eligibility and/or state requirements
- E.g. No sub-allocation, CMAQ eligible projects, air quality
- Federal aid process and project delivery considerations
- Efficiently and cost-effectively navigate federal funds.
- Multiple objectives

Is your project a good fit for Regional Flexible Funds Step 2?

- Advances the RTP goals & meets criteria.
- Review criteria and measures.
- Meets minimum eligibility requirements.
- Can navigate federal aid process successfully.
- Is ready to obligate in FFYs 2028-2030

Comments from the committee:

Jessica Horning noted the Sept. 11 recreational trails grant webinar and if this might conflict with the Call for Projects applicant workshop mentioned in the presentation. It was asked will Metro provide any sort of preliminary ranking of projects received through the pre-application process to help agencies determine whether or not they should put in the effort for a full application (similar to SRTS pre-apps)? Or are the pre-apps just to give Metro an idea of overall demand for the funding?

Grace Cho noted we're looking at this more from the perspective of the overall demand and understanding the application support request. It will be an opportunity for Metro to be able to confirm from applications some bare minimum eligibility requirements or if we have some questions or follow up. I'm particularly thinking about ensuring the project is coming from the financially constrained regional transportation plan. Beyond that there is not an intention to do any initial

preliminary ranking. We hope to find a gauge for who's planning to apply and confirm this with applicants.

CJ Doxsee asked is the 10.27% match required to be cash or can it be in-kind? VC Leybold noted it can be in-kind for eligible in-kind expenses, which is a process that is yet to be defined. You have to request that. This will all be worked out with staff from the Oregon Department of Transportation. You have to describe what the in-kind match is in the application. There will be a process to determine whether it's eligible and then a process to put an agreement in place as part of your IGA with ODOT. There is a chance that slows your IGA process down. I would say cash is better, but you can have in-kind, just make sure that you're creating time within your project schedule and getting on that early in the process so it doesn't delay your project.

Tanya Battye asked does applying for development funding impact future development applications/awards for the same project? If we were awarded the development funding and then went through to construction, can we then apply on the same project for construction funding as well? Ms. Cho noted a simple straightforward answer to that is yes. VC Leybold added sometimes folks have done that but haven't gotten started in time to apply for the next immediate cycle and sometimes have had to wait two cycles. We are hoping to do some speeding up of some of those. If your jurisdiction has the staff and matching capacity right away, we can try to work with you to be faster so that you can apply in the next cycle. Oftentimes people wait and skip a cycle when they get project development funding before they then apply for construction funding.

A link in the chat was noted for the RTP project finder application:

<https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/a3272005eba14fd98631fab49c8195a0> If you are wondering whether or not your project is in the financially constrained RTP you can find the list of specific projects there. It was added there are some types of projects that can be part of a programmatic project in the RTP financially constrained list. If you're not sure you have something like that or if you're in the financially constrained list, contact Ms. Cho and we can work through questions about that in terms of that eligibility.

Tiffany Gehrike noted the City of Tigard met with Ms. Cho to talk about another project for the Step 1, but after that meeting we were in discussion about other projects that were on the financially constrained RTP list that would, we believe, be a good candidate for the Step 2. We're in early conversations about a project that we have upcoming. We have quite a bit of funding already allocated, some federal funding already allocated towards it, but there is quite a bit of shortage with cost increases and things like that. It is a bridge replacement for a facility that would connect to the Fanno Creek Trail. It also currently has no bike and pedestrian facilities on it. I wanted to early gauge the thoughts on a project to that scale. Again, we'd have plenty of local match and other funds matching but just a question on that magnitude of a project and the appetite for something like that.

Ms. Cho noted in the Step 2 process Metro has established cost minimums but not cost maximums for applications. We are mainly looking for meeting those minimum thresholds for projects. Project applications can come in at whatever request they would like, but it's probably good to recognize that again, the to that we're looking at is between 47 and 60 million and we are aiming to allocate those dollars across the region. Trying to put together a project request that balances those different thoughts and objectives is where we would suggest. Not to say that project requests that have come in fairly significant in the past we've had discussion directly with the applicant about the potential of the scaling of that project, especially if it is the sub-regional priority for that part of the region.

The question about the appetite for addressing a project in a shortfall through these regional flexible funds that's a little bit of a challenge. The nature of how our Step 2 process looks is that we're looking at how well the projects are advancing those regional transportation plan objectives. Or at least it's one component that we're looking at, let alone the specifics around the project delivery and all of the four components of consideration which I'll speak to in my next portion of the presentation. We have funded shortfalls in previous projects in the past. Oftentimes those projects have either been projects awarded through RFFA previously. The objective of having those projects through the line, or they brought in significant new funding to the region, but new funding didn't necessarily fulfill their funding request. VC Leybold added we want to make sure for project readiness that the other funds that are there are helpful in terms of getting something delivered quickly as opposed to not getting them on schedule rather than risk that. So we would check on that as well. It was agreed it's important the project is a good match relative to the evaluation criteria that are in place and is it going to be competitive in terms of rating well and advancing.

Ms. Gehrike thought the project fed into the greater bike and pedestrian network, especially with the connection to the Fanno Creek Trail. I didn't see an inclusion in a must costlier effort. We already have funds allocated toward the bridge replacement, but this would be topping that off to get that gap in the network over the finish line. Asked if it is currently a federal aid project and being delivered by ODOT, that was confirmed.

Jean Senechal Biggs noted I don't think I heard you specifically mention the Designing Livable Streets guidelines as a requirement. Is that just embedded in the RTP goals, or will there be more specific things that we should be thinking about. It was noted more detail was coming in the next section of this presentation and how we're looking to utilize the guide. Lake McTighe provided a link in chat: View/download the regional Designing Livable Streets and Trails Guide here: <https://www.oregonmetro.gov/tools-partners/guides-and-tools/guidelines-designing-livable-streets-and-trails>

Gregg Snyder noted a Better Bus/ITS project, which are not listed individually in the RTP. My understanding is we are going to tuck those under programmatic type places. That seems appropriate. I just want to confirm that. VC Leybold noted that's one where if you have one of those, we want to make sure and review it with you to ensure it actually fits under that programmatic description and agree with you that it does, because that's the intent of that programmatic. But the programmatic projects in the RTP have some specific definition and criteria to them. So we'll want to make sure if that's what your project is coming in under that we confirm with you that it does fit.

A 5-minute break was taken in the meeting.

The second part of the presentation began with descriptions of the four components to inform allocation recommendation; outcome evaluations, risk assessment, public comment and coordinating committees. Outcomes Evaluation focuses on the five RTP goals and design, follows Metro's Designing Livable Streets and Trails guidance, and how candidate projects advance toward regional aspirations. Risk Assessment includes assessing candidate project's ability to navigate federal aid process, ratings and flags for project delivery risks and readiness, and recommendations for project scope if awarded funds.

A summary of outcomes evaluation performance measures and methods were shown. An overview of the Outcomes Evaluation Report was provided. Projects outcomes displayed in two ways: overall score or rating, and how well they performed in each RTP goal areas and design. The purpose is to illustrate

the technical attributes of the project with the objective comparison of projects to advance regional priorities. Details on the risk assessment was given including the analysis of project scope, budget, and timeline. The purpose is to identify up front any issues that may delay project, impact the design, and lead to cost overruns. Outcomes Evaluation & Risk Assessment Key Dates were given.

Comments from the committee:

Sarah Paulus asked if you could speak more to how public input will be considered? Will it just be passed along to the coordinating committees to help them identify their priority projects? Or is there a more formal process to incorporate that feedback? Ms. Cho noted we will produce a public comment report at the end of the public comment period slated for late March through the month of April. Essentially the report will be something that we're sending out broadly to various partners and committees. TPAC will receive this as well as JPACT and the coordinating committees.

Jaimie Lorenzini noted it was helpful seeing the cart of the different methods and strategies of how we're looking at outcomes. Will we have access to the Outcomes Evaluation scoring rubric to assist in the development of narrative responses? Ms. Cho noted I think your question is a step ahead of where my head has been specifically on this. Let me follow up with this soon. It might be trying to have whether considered a dummy application or an actual previously successful application. Again, with recognizing that the policy objectives might have been slightly different from a previous cycle. Maybe trying to make something like that available to give applicants a sense of what were key things to a successful application. Ms. Lorenzini agreed on this idea. It's like how you know if you want something concise versus giving you a whole novel about the transportation design elements.

Ms. Lorenzini asked, as we start to think about coordinating committee feedback, have you already been in touch with the staff liaisons with the coordinating committees to get on the agenda or get it on their radar timing wise. Ms. Cho noted we've been letting the coordinating committees lead at when they find it's the right time or appropriateness to have Metro staff attend. We're always happy to attend and provide updates and presentations. I want to recognize that other business happens at coordinating committees and it's not just a regional show. Ms. Lorenzini wondered if giving a really far out heads up on the deadline by which you need coordinating committee feedback might be helpful as we get into the Fall. Things will become more complex as we prepare for the 2025 transportation package and the next legislative session. I would like to keep this front of mind for them.

VC Leybold noted in terms of getting some formal feedback or recommendations from the regional coordinating committees on their priority projects that does happen after the public comment period so that they have the benefit of the public comments in helping them make that determination. Ms. Cho added we would anticipate receiving those in May of 2025. I believe as part of the process with the public comment report last cycle there were a set of instructions as to how to request those coordinating committee priorities if electing to do so, with the schedule and time frame for that. As noted, there are a lot of concurrent activities planned so trying to put together a specific schedule just for the coordinating committee leads might be helpful, so they are clearly aware of when we anticipate or ask their input.

Adjournment

There being no further business, workshop meeting was adjourned by Vice Chair Leybold at 10:40 a.m. Respectfully submitted,

Marie Miller

Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC workshop meeting, August 14, 2024

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	8/14/2024	8/14/2024 TPAC Workshop Agenda	081424T-01
2	2024 TPAC Work Program	8/6/2024	2024 TPAC Work Program as of 8/6/2024	081424T-02
3	Minutes	6/12/2024	Minutes for TPAC workshop, 6/12/2024	081424T-03
4	Memo	8/8/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 – Pre-Application & Application Assistance Instructions	081424T-04
5	Handout	N/A	2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 2 Allocation Letter of Intent to Apply Template	081424T-05
6	Memo	8/8/2024	TO: TPAC and interested parties From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner RE: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures	081424T-06
7	Presentation	8/14/2024	2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) Step 2 – Pre-Application & Evaluation	081424T-07