



Meeting minutes

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

Date/time: Friday, October 4, 2019 | 9:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.

Place: Metro Regional Center, Council chamber

Members Attending

Tom Kloster, Chair
Karen Buehrig
Chris Deffebach
Eric Hesse
Dayna Webb
Katherine Kelly
Jeff Owen
Laurie Lebowsky
Tom Bouillion
Tyler Bullen
Glenn Koehrsen
Beverly Drottar
Rachael Tupica

Affiliate

Metro
Clackamas County
Washington County
City of Portland
City of Oregon City and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Gresham and Cities of Multnomah County
TriMet
Washington State Department of Transportation
Port of Portland
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
Federal Highway Administration

Alternates Attending

Allison Boyd
Jaimie Huff
Garet Prior
Glen Bolen
Karen Williams

Affiliate

Multnomah County
City of Happy Valley and Cities of Clackamas County
City of Tualatin and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Members Excused

Jessica Berry
Lynda David
Don Odermott
Mandy Putney
Cory Ann Wind
Jessica Stetson
Maria Hernandez-Segoviano
Emily Lai
Jennifer Campos
Rob Klug
Shawn M. Donaghy
Jeremy Borrego
Cullen Stephenson

Affiliate

Multnomah County
SW Washington Regional Transportation Council
City of Hillsboro and Cities of Washington County
Oregon Department of Transportation
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Community Representative
Community Representative
Community Representative
City of Vancouver, Washington
Clark County
C-Tran System
Federal Transit Administration
Washington Department of Ecology

Guests Attending

Whitney Esquerre

Affiliate

Federal Highway Administration

Lidwien Rahman
Kari Schlosshauer
Susan Bladholm
Jean Senechal Biggs
Camilla Dartnell
Biney M. Koshy
Stephen McWilliams
Jennifer Dill

Oregon Department of Transportation
Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership
Friends of Frog Ferry
City of Beaverton
Kittelson
Kittelson
City of Milwaukie
Portland State University

Metro Staff Attending

Kim Ellis, Principal Transportation Planner	Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead
Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner	Eliot Rose, Senior Tech & Transportation Planner
Tim Collins, Senior Transportation Planner	Ted Leybold, Planning & Development Resource Mgr.
Caleb Winter, Senior Transportation Planner	Marne Duke, Senior Public Affairs Specialist
Clifford Higgins, Comm. Program Mgr.	John Mermin, Senior Transportation Planner
Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner	Lake McTighe, Senior Transportation Planner
Margi Bradway, Dep. Director Planning & Dev.	Valeria Vidal, Associate Management Analyst
Noel Mickelberry, Associate Trans Planner	Walle Brown, Planning & Dev. Intern
Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder	

1. Call to Order, Declaration of a Quorum and Introductions

Chairman Tom Kloster called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum was declared of members present. Introductions were made. The new alternate member for Multnomah County was introduced; Allison Boyd. Jessica Berry is the appointed member for Multnomah County. Rachael Tupica introduced Whitney Esquerra, Federal Highway Administration, in the audience.

2. Comments From the Chair and Committee Members

- **Monthly MTIP Amendments Update** (Ken Lobeck)
Ken Lobeck provided an update on the August/Sept. 2019 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) monthly submitted amendments. A memo with details on the summary of submitted formal amendments, additional projects submitted as part of the Sept. 2019 formal amendment bundle/combining projects, and MTIP Administrative Modifications. For questions or further information the committee is asked to contact Mr. Lobeck.
- **TriMet Mobility on Demand/Open Trip Planner Project Update** (Jeff Owen)
Jeff Owen provided information on the TriMet Mobility on Demand/Open Trip Planner Demonstration with details in the handout in the meeting packet. It was noted that car2go would no longer be in service after Oct. 31 and not shown on the map. TriMet has applied for further FTA funding, and looks forward to working with its partners to expand multiple modes of transportation services. More on this issue will be presented at the Jan. 10, 2020 TPAC meeting.
- **2020-2021 Unified Planning Work Program Process Update** (John Mermin)
John Mermin provided a brief update on the planned process for the 2020-2021 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Starting Oct. 22 a message to the project managers will be sent with timelines, templates, and example of new, shorter narratives. This year the emphasis will be on concise narratives, more plain language for easier public accessibility, and tied to the

four priorities focuses in the RTP (safety, equity, climate and congestion). Budget summaries will be simplified in the new version. The committee can expect to see the UPWP draft electronically sent in late January. For further information on the UPWP contact Mr. Mermin.

- **2021-2024 MTIP Network Review and Data Request for No Build** (Grace Cho)
Grace Cho reminded jurisdictional partners that the deadline to submit roadway and bicycle facility projects completed since 2015 and those projects expected to be completed by end of calendar year 2020 is Oct. 31, 2019. These projects will be included in a new 2020 base year network. It was also important to identify all future roadway and bicycle facility projects with committed funding to be included in a new 2024 no build network. The memo on this subject with contact information is included in the meeting packet.
- **Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) 2020 Meeting Schedule/TPAC on the Road** (Chair Kloster)
The proposed 2020 calendar for TPAC meetings was provided (memo in packet). Chairman Kloster called attention to scheduling meetings in communities in the region, approximately quarterly during the TPAC 2020 calendar year. Public, community buildings and nonprofit offices with audio/presentation capabilities and space for meetings would be encouraged. The first ½ hour of these meetings could highlight local topics. The combined workshop schedule with Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC) will be provided to TPAC soon. For interest in hosting TPAC in 2020 the committee is encouraged to contact Marie Miller and Chairman Kloster.
- **TPAC Parking Lot Discussion; Future topics/Periodic updates** (All)
Chairman Kloster drew attention to the Parking Lot section of the work program, in the meeting packet. It was requested to review the list and send Marie Miller suggested additions on future agenda items to be considered for TPAC meetings.

3. Public Communications on Agenda Items - none

4. Consideration of TPAC Minutes from September 6, 2019

Corrections to the September 6, 2019 minutes:

Katherine Kelly asked that the minutes, page 3, second bullet, now read “Katherine Kelly noted that the technical and risk assessments of the evaluation were to be shared prior to the public comments period”.

Glen Bolen asked that the minutes, page 9, fourth bullet, last sentence now read “Mr. Turnoy acknowledged the study is just one of many things that ODOT and regional partners should and do look at to address congestion with multi-modal strategies, intended to address operational and safety issues at freeway bottlenecks. The study is one part of the region’s approach of multi-modal strategies.

MOTION: To approve the minutes from September 6, 2019 with corrections made.

Moved: Glenn Koehrsen

Seconded: Jeff Owen

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously. These corrected minutes will be posted online.

5. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Formal Amendment 19-5037

Ken Lobeck provided information on the October 2019 Formal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) Formal/Full Amendment bundle (for FFY 2020) that contains changes and

updates impacting Portland, Tualatin, TriMet and Washington County. Four projects comprise the amendment bundle.

Portland's Central City in Motion (CCIM) Key 19299

Summary:

- Project will provide various safety/active transportation (ped and bicycle) improvements at multiple locations in the central city area
- Originally proposed as a federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funded project
- Metro, Portland, and TriMet are completing a fund exchange to enable CCIM to be delivered as a locally funded project
- CMAQ funds will be applied to TriMet purchase of electric buses
- Amendment action: Replace CMAQ with local funds

TriMet's Division Transit Project – Key 20844

Summary:

- Project will provide high capacity transit on Division St from Portland Central Business District to Gresham
- Federal funding from FTA Section 5309 Small Starts grant program
- 5309 allocations were expected to occur annually and programmed across three years (In Keys 20844, 20845, and 20846)

TriMet Division Transit Project is currently program in three projects across three years in:

FY 2019 in Key 20844 = \$7.7 million

FY 2020 in Key 20845 = \$56 million

FY 2021 in Key 20846 = \$34.7 million

- Total 5309 programmed is \$98.4 million
- Final authorized 5309 funds are approximately \$87.5 million
- Total project cost = \$175 million
- FTA wants to award funding from Keys 20845 & 20846

Summary:

- FTA requires TriMet's grant submission in FTA's Transit Award Management System (TrAMS) for final award by December 2019
- Key 20846 is being advanced into FY 2020 per FTA direction via a separate administrative modification
- Final approved and available 5309 funding will be covered in Keys 20845 and 20846 (now programmed in FY 2020)
- Key 20844 with \$7 million of 5309 is not required and is being cancelled from the MTIP
- Amendment action: Cancel Key 20844

Tualatin and Washington County Project – Keys 20815 and 19358

- Fund exchange among Metro, Tualatin, and Washington County:
 - De-federalizes Tualatin's SW Herman Rd project
 - Transfers the Surface Transportation Program funds to Washington County's Basalt Creek Parkway Extension project
 - Washington County provides Metro with local funds to reimburse Tualatin

Comments from the committee:

- Karen Buehrig were the \$7 million funding of the project being cancelled (TriMet's Division Street project) was going. Mr. Lobeck reported it went nowhere; it simply would not exist anymore. Final authorized 5309 funds were approximately \$87.5 million, based on slightly higher projections. It was confirmed that this action reflects funding coming in now lower than expected for the project. Jeff Owen noted that this amendment action cancels Key 20844 but moves forward Keys 20845 and 20846 to complete the project.

MOTION: To provide approval recommendation to JPACT of Resolution 19-5037, for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP involving four projects impacting Portland, Tualatin, TriMet and Washington County, and direct staff to make all necessary corrections to amendment documents.

Moved: Eric Hesse

Seconded: Chris Deffebach

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

6. Frog Ferry Project Update

Susan Bladholm with Friends of Frog Ferry presented information on proposed plans for a passenger ferry service on the Willamette and Columbia River in this region. The goals of the service are to:

- Reduce congestion
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Remove thousands of cars from the road every day.
- Build resiliency and emergency response
- Enhance community livability
- Provide jobs and connect workers to workplaces

Frog Ferry would provide up to four 149-passenger commuter ferries with up to 9 stops between Oregon City and Vancouver, WA. The service schedule, time and stops would vary based on demand. Estimated commute time Vancouver to Salmon Springs = 38 minutes. Average ticket cost (estimated) is \$5.50 daily/\$125 monthly.

Project Timeline

2017 & 2018: Proved mission, attracted expertise

Delivered concept plan, expert teams, website, media launch, non-profit board/governance created, coalition building. *\$500,000 value delivered at no tax payer expense*

2019: Feasibility Studies, secure funding \$650,000- *all are funded*

\$83,000 secured in cash and commitments to date and multiple public and private requests pending.

- Demand Modeling-Nov 2019
- Triple Bottom Line-Jan 2020
- Operational Requirements-Jan 2020
- Best Practices Case Studies- *delivered*

Staffing and Professional Services: Legal, web, social, PR, gov't affairs, coalition building—
\$83,000 secured in cash and commitments to date and multiple public and private requests pending. *\$1.5 million value delivered at no tax payer expense*

2020 Operational and Finance Plan, secure funding \$650,000

2021 Go or No Go Decision

2022-2023 Start Service

We need FFF to become a Regional Priority

- We are in the RTP (and are included in Vancouver's RTP)
- To be a public transit mode, this service will require a subsidy
- We are not yet in the MTIP
- We are working with the local transit agencies, with full transparency
- Because we are a new mode, we need help to find the proper funding mechanism.

(We are bumping up against not having funding streams for water-based public transit in Oregon.)

Next Steps

- We will gather results of the Feasibility Studies
 - Finance and Operations Feasibility Study
 - Triple Bottom Line Feasibility Study
 - Demand Modeling (working with PBOT, TriMet and Metro)
- Return in 2020 Q1 with a Financial Plan and Request
 - In 2020 we will build out the Business Plan

Comments from the committee:

- Katherine Kelly if the operations were to start and modeling for the project done, what has been planned for the access points along the river and how is land use integrated into the project. Ms. Bladholm noted this was a key element in the feasibility study for operations and infrastructure. The plan is to start without a lot of buildout. Asked what opposition there was known to the project, Ms. Bladholm reported on lack of confidence and understanding out the project. Ms. Bladholm believes approximately \$60 million could get it started, making it a cost effective transportation option in the region.
- Karen Buehrig asked what the coordination between cities and county of Clackamas has been with the project. Ms. Bladholm reported communications with Willamette Trust, tribes in the area and contacts on the Willamette Falls project. Legislative representatives on cities and the County have shown less support, but are expected to be presented with more data when obtained.
- Tom Bouillion mentioned the density of workers on island with limited dock space. It was suggested that Swan Island would be a better location with commuter service rather than Cathedral Park. Ms. Bladholm noted that Swan Island was listed on an earlier plan but is having issues with dock permits and superfund sites. The best strategical location sites are still being discussed.
- Tyler Bullen asked if the project is planned at 70% operationally public subsidized where is this funding likely to come from? Ms. Bladholm reported that the goal is closer to 50% public subsidy. The organization is looking for support in finding public funding while keeping costs of operations down and providing cost effective service.
- Glenn Koehrsen mentioned the challenges with transit system connections getting from one system to another for final destinations. Infrastructure at docks to other modes of transport is important. Ms. Bladholm agreed, noting that each stop of the ferry service would be an individual business case for access.
- Chris Deffebach suggested looking into provisions in the Federal plans and Marine Highway systems for better understand of plans and funding with projects such as this.
- Rachael Tupica mentioned a small amount of funding in Federal Highway Administration that could be looked into. On the project timeline, the presentation showed both 2019 secure funding and 2020 for this funding amount. Ms. Bladholm clarified that all funding in 2019 was

allocated to the feasibility study, which will not be completed until the first quarter of 2020. Funding is needed for the operational and finance plan in 2020.

- Glen Bolen asked if other ferry operators had a sliding scale pricing fare, such as tourism vs. commuters. Ms. Bladholm mentioned a link on the website with best practices analysis done for this study and the flexibility the service could provide integrating to other transit systems.

7. Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) technical, risk, public comment report

Dan Kaempff, Metro and Camilla Dartnell and Bincy Koshy with Kittelson & Associates presented information on the Regional Flexible Funds Allocation (RFFA) technical, risk and public comment evaluations. Input from the committee was asked for development of the draft recommendation on project funds.

Mr. Kaempff reviewed the policy direction (step 2) that was provided earlier in the year. These include:

- Allocation objectives
- RTP investment priorities (Equity, Safety, Climate and Congestion)
- Two project categories, funding targets
 - Active Transportation 75% / Freight 25%
 - Ability to apply in both categories

The project proposals with technical analysis were reported in the project spreadsheet comparisons, sent out prior to the meeting and in the updated packet. It was noted that the risk assessment was evaluated on the relative degree of risk to delivering a project, based with on-time, within budget and per scope in the application. The overall intent of the risk assessment is to improve overall funding obligation and project delivery.

Camilla Dartnell presented information on the risk and readiness evaluation. Kittelson used comparison to other MPO and state processes, best practices, past professional experience in evaluating the RFFA proposed projects. The applications were screened using a framework, providing criteria for project risk in development status/readiness, quality of project information, and complexity/potential implementation challenges.

Mr. Kaempff noted that in addition to the technical analysis and risk assessments, there were two other considerations to be used to develop a project recommendation for TPAC, the public comment report and identification of coordinating committee priorities. The public comment period that closes Oct. 7 has already shown a strong level of response. The full report on these will be provided after Oct. 15. The county coordinating committee priorities with additional local information are due prior to the November JPACT meeting to use in the Dec. TPAC recommendation.

Comments from the committee:

- Katherine Kelly commented on the concern with technical and risk assessment initial process reported prior to the public comment period with the opportunity to provide feedback, which was not done. JPACT received numbers associated with scores which TPAC had not. The scale in of ratings is a small difference that provides significant rating factors. A more defined scale that is more subjective of ratings would be preferred.

Regarding risk assessment, new data on projects could change the ratings and perception on how viewed. It was suggested that applicants and Metro help lead the input on equity, as a low percent of the demographics in the region are being represented. A question from the

committee on the four factors of evaluation (technical, risk assessment, public comment and coordinating committees), how are these all weighted, rated and prioritized?

- Tom Bouillion commented on the Cully-Columbia Freight Improvements project with concern that all factors be considered in the risk assessment rating, linked to other projects. Likewise the ODOT/Rail connection in the Monroe Street Greenway project that is in the planning process. Ms. Dartnell commented on the scoring matrix with these projects and building steps for issues such as right of ways. The risk criteria measured points with each project.
- Rachael Tupica called attention to investments across the region and importance of not pre-selecting projects. Federal performance measurements can be used to help guide the investment process. There was concern on the income and racial identities responses in the applications. What type of public outreach and strategies were used for reaching those with less income and people of color with this? Mr. Kaempff reported that Metro has developed community networks for outreach with programs, and added interpretive language materials. It was suggested that more outreach in target groups be done, with performance targets incorporated in the evaluation and studied for further development.
- Garet Prior commented on some discrepancies where future planning processes could capture what kind of public engagement has gained with equity, and improvements in the matrix. Rather than commenting on just current concerns or limitations, future planning could be built into the matrix. More information on project partners and impacts in planned development could be added to the projects being evaluated now. Will there be time to add these to the discussions before the JPACT meeting? Mr. Kaempff reported additional information can be added but would not change the risk assessments.
- Glen Bolen commented on the need to expand on more public engagement, perhaps with library computer access and information there on taking the survey. On the gender identification question on the survey, why separate the categories in this manner? It was suggested to move the Sandy Blvd. to Railroad underpass project to Freight category.
- Chris Deffebach commented on the addition of reporting on project readiness as a good move for process allocation. Regarding projects asking for funds to project development vs. capital project funding, is there a better way to show the level of risk to projects? Ms. Dartnell commented on the risk summaries that showed construction to projects as opposed to development of projects. The risk scoring was intended to show the funding to design and/or construction but would be helpful to separate them for funding purposes.

It was suggested that the technical analysis failed to capture understanding of projects with opportunities and benefits of projects, and how these projects interacted with each other across the region. Rather than focus on just the numerical charts and ratings, better information in the technical analysis could be developed. Public comments in Washington County with need for deeper outreach efforts were acknowledged. It was suggested to not focus on just the historic data but use to leverage and build on further engagement.

- Karen Buehrig commented on the freight projects and the difficulty viewing the same with a balance to active transportation in this category. She is supportive of the freight projects and would advise the coordinating committees to support also. The 25% funding allocated to these projects is a small targeted amount for projects to improve the freight system, and although the scoring for these was low, it is important for JPACT to see and approve the significance with freight, including those asking for both funding categories.

Regarding public comments it was advised to be careful on how the data is used. It was unclear what the opposition to projects meant, such as not liking a certain project or favoring another project. Local opposition to projects should be understood in the jurisdictions with more improvement on this in the next round. It was encouraged to get the information on the evaluations out quickly as coordinating committees had fast approaching deadlines.

- Eric Hesse commented on this being a good step forward, following JPACT and Metro Council policy direction. He agreed on more useable and understandable evaluation an assessment that compares the scales and rankings, accounting for subjectivity for purpose of project strategies. More definition with technical scoring with qualifications on freight projects that include both categories could be further developed in the next cycle.
- Katherine Kelly agreed on the idea of the one-pager with projects, possibly with Metro template, that shows the criteria used for the project without the numbers. Regarding the risk analysis, instead of the rating scale perhaps just flag issues as key factors for potential risks. It was requested to include on the record that the Division Complete Street project was agreed to by both the City of Gresham and Metro by signed IGA as a regionally significant project and would be prioritized for funding. This is also noted for its regional transportation corridor status.

Applicants could be encouraged to show historical record of project deliverability with equitable access to corridors, where appropriate. It was agreed that pulling one of the Multnomah County freight & active transportation projects to just the freight category would be appropriate.

- Chris Deffebach appreciated noting that all the information is available online with the RFFA website, but more work on the part of the committee and Metro can be done to further share this information.
- Glen Bolen suggested calling the community support rephrased to potential controversy due to lack of equity input supporting these projects.

Discussion was held on freight allocation in different categories and having this being further discussed at the Nov. TPAC meeting. Clarification was noted on the coordinating committees having yet to weigh in on these issues, and the need to have criteria shown with the separation of categories. The committee agreed that for the Nov. TPAC meeting different options would be presented from staff for consideration on these issues.

8. Metro Legislative Recap

This agenda item was not presented. The committee asked for a summary report from the 2019 legislative session regarding transportation issues. A report on the expected 2020 legislative session issues was requested, and will be scheduled in the coming year work program under 'Comments from the chair', reported by Randy Tucker.

9. Regional Mobility Policy Work Plan

Kim Ellis and Lidwien Rahman presented an update on the Regional Mobility Policy Work Plan. The memo with information on this was sent to the committee recently. Feedback on the draft project objectives, key work plan tasks and stakeholders to be engaged throughout the project was requested. The project scope will be further refined in preparation for further discussion with and decisions by JPACT and Metro Council. Before the Nov. TPAC meeting it was encouraged to read the memo with

draft work plan and engagement plan and to send feedback, questions or input to Ms. Ellis and Ms. Rahman in advance of the next meeting. Ms. Ellis explained TPAC will be asked to make a recommendation to JPACT at the next meeting.

Comments from the committee:

- Glen Bolen suggested adding a press/media strategy and legislative strategy to the work plan. Considering the importance with the policy to the region, a clear understanding with the process to state legislative members was important.

10. Committee Feedback on Creating a Safe Space at TPAC

Chairman Kloster read the comments from the committee on feedback and suggestions for safe space at TPAC meetings.

- Question on further discussion about paying community representatives for their time and contribution. Yes, the compensation/stipend discussions and now currently being held and plan to be implemented in January 2020 with the start of new terms. They will be offered to all community members of the committee at that time.
- Comment given on intentional with positive comments to start the meeting and about agenda item discussions. The committee agreed this was a positive factor in our meetings.

11. Adjourn

There being no further business, meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kloster at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder

Attachments to the Public Record, TPAC meeting, Oct. 4, 2019

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
1	Agenda	10/04/2019	10/04/2019 TPAC Agenda	100419T-01
2	TPAC Work Program	9/20/2019	TPAC Work Program, as of 9/20/2019	100419T-02
3	Memo	9/26/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Ken Lobeck, Funding Programs Lead RE: August/Sept. 2019 MTIP Monthly Submitted Amendments	100419T-03
4	Handout	10/04/2019	TriMet Mobility On Demand (MOD) Open Trip Planner (OTP) Demonstration	100419T-04
5	Memo	07/12/2019	TO:TPAC and Interested parties From: Grace Cho, Senior Transportation Planner RE: Request for Agency Review of 2015 Base Year Network for 2021-2024 MTIP Performance Assessment	100419T-05
6	Memo	09/27/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Marie Miller, TPAC Recorder RE: 2020 TPAC meeting schedule	100419T-06
7	Minutes	09/06/2019	Draft Minutes from TPAC Sept. 6, 2019 Meeting	100419T-07
8	Resolution 19-5037	10/04/2019	Resolution 19-5037 for the purpose of adding or amending existing projects to the 2018-21 MTIP involving four projects impacting Portland, Tualatin, TriMet and Washington County	100419T-08
9	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5037	10/04/2019	Exhibit A to Resolution 19-5037, 2018-21 MTIP	100419T-09
10	Staff Report	09/26/2019	Staff Report to Resolution 19-5037, 2018-21 MTIP	100419T-10
11	Attachment 1 to Resolution 19-5037	09/26/2019	Attachment 1 to Resolution 19-5037, 2018-21 MTIP	100419T-11
12	Handout	N/A	Friends of Frog Ferry Passenger Ferry Service Initiative	100419T-12
13	Memo	09/27/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Dan Kaempff, Principal Transportation Planner RE:2022-24 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation	100419T-13
14	Memo	10/02/2019	TO: Dan Kaempff, Metro From: Camilla Dartnell, Russ Doubleday, Bincy Koshy, Brian L. Ray, Kittelson & Associates RE: Regional Flexible Funds Risk Assessment	100419T-14
15	Handout	10/04/2019	Draft for Discussion: 2022-24 RFFA Project Evaluation	100419T-15

Item	DOCUMENT TYPE	DOCUMENT DATE	DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION	DOCUMENT No.
16	Memo	10/03/2019	TO: TPAC and Interested Parties From: Kim Ellis, Metro Project Manager, Lidwien Rahman, ODOT Project Manager RE: Regional Mobility Policy Update – Draft Work Plan and Engagement Plan	100419T-16
17	Presentation	10/04/2019	October 2019 MTIP Formal Amendment Summary	100419T-17
18	Presentation	10/04/2019	Friends of Frog Ferry	100419T-18
19	Presentation	10/04/2019	2022-2024 Regional Flexible Funds Allocation	100419T-19