

To request translation or disability-related accommodations, please contact us at **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

Si quiere solicitar servicios de traducción o adaptaciones para la discapacidad, contáctenos en/al **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

Чтобы запросить перевод или приспособления, связанные с инвалидностью, пожалуйста, свяжитесь с нами по: **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

Щоб попросити переклад або спеціальні послуги для осіб з особливими потребами, зверніться до нас, скориставшись такими контактними даними: **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**

如需翻译服务或残障相关的协助，请与我们联系：**C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468**

。

Để yêu cầu dịch vụ dịch thuật hoặc điều chỉnh liên quan đến tình trạng khuyết tật, vui lòng liên hệ với chúng tôi qua **C4@clackamas.us | 971-469-1468.**



**Clackamas County**  
[www.clackamas.us](http://www.clackamas.us)

---

**Wednesday, February 19, 2025**  
**7:30 AM – 9:00 AM**

**Virtual Meeting:**

<https://clackamascounty.zoom.us/j/82890851857?pwd=DZSrBTmUaA9UUDF4O5JPb1Sv3vWlyh.1>

---

**Agenda**

**7:30 a.m. Welcome & Introductions**

**7:35 a.m. JPACT Updates ([JPACT Materials](#))**

- 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 (Bond) Updates  
*Presenting: Karen Buehrig, Clackamas*  
*Jeff Owen, Clackamas*
- 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 (Local Grants) Updates  
*Presenting: Jeff Owen, Clackamas*  
*Will Farley, Lake Oswego*

**TPAC Updates**

- February Meeting Highlights  
*Presenting: Jeff Owen, Clackamas*  
*Will Farley, Lake Oswego*

**8:40 a.m. MPAC Updates ([MPAC Materials](#))**

**MTAC Update**

- N/A

**Attachments:**

JPACT and MPAC Work Programs	Page 02
Staff Update on RFFA Step 1 and 2	Page 05
Staff Presentation on RFFA Step 1 and 2	Page 09
RFFA Step 1 and 2 Technical Reference Material	Page 17
TPAC Update	Page 57

## 2025 JPACT Work Program

*As of 1/8/25*

*Items in italics are tentative*

<p><b>January 16, 2025- in person</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments from the Chair- Regional Rail Study Update (5 min)</li> <li>• Resolution no. 5456 For The Purpose Of Adding Or Amending Nine Projects To The 2024-27 Mtip Including Six New Americans With Disabilities Act Upgrade Projects To Meet Federal Project Delivery Requirements <b>(consent)</b></li> <li>• Consideration of the 12/19 JPACT Minutes <b>(consent)</b></li> <li>• JPACT workplan review (Ted Leybold, Metro; Betsy Emery, Metro; 20 min)</li> <li>• Cooling Corridors (Andre' Lightsey-Walker, Metro; 30 min)</li> <li>• RFFA: Draft Scenario Assessment (Grace Cho and Ted Leybold; 30 min)</li> </ul>	<p><b>February 20, 2025- online</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of January 16 Minutes (consent)</li> <li>• <b>Resolution no. 25-5464</b> For the Purpose of FFY 2025 Redistribution Funding Awards <b>(consent)</b></li> <li>• <b>Resolution no. 25-5465</b> For The Purpose Of Canceling An ODOT Rail Hazards Safety Project And Adding Three New Metro Planning Studies To The 2024-27 MTIP <b>(consent)</b></li> <li>• RFFA: Revised Scenario Assessment (Grace Cho, Metro, 30 min)</li> <li>• Rose Quarter MTIP discussion (Megan Channel, ODOT 30 min)</li> <li>• 82nd Avenue Transit Project LPA update (Melissa Ashbaugh, 30 min)</li> </ul>
<p><b>March 20, 2025- in person</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Legislative Update (Anneliese Koehler, Metro; 10 min)</li> <li>• <b>Resolution no. 25-5463</b> For The Purpose Of Amending Three Related I-5 Rose Quarter Projects To The 2024-27 Mtip To Add \$250 Million Dollars Of Approved Funding To The Projects <b>(action)</b></li> <li>• RFAA Step 1A: Scenario packages recommendation for public comment <b>(action)</b> (Grace Cho, Metro)</li> <li>• Federal Surface Transportation Reauthorization regional priorities &amp; T4A Transportation Overview (Beth Osbourne (invited), Transportation for America; Betsy Emery, Metro; 30 min)</li> </ul>	<p><b>April 17, 2025- online</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TV Highway LPA Update (Jess Zdeb, Metro; 20 min)</li> <li>• Unified Planning Work Program (John Mermin, Metro; 20min)</li> <li>• Community Connections Transit Study: Policy Framework and Vision Considerations (Ally Holmqvist, Metro; 20 min)</li> <li>• US DOT Certification of MPO: Findings (Tom Kloster and Ted Leybold &amp; Federal staff; 40 min)</li> </ul>
<p><b>May 15, 2025- in person</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Legislative Update (Anneliese Koehler, 10 min)</li> <li>• UPWP <b>(action)</b></li> <li>• 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue LPA Adoption <b>(action)</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>June 12, 2025- online</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JPACT Trip update</li> <li>• Montgomery Park LPA Update ( Alex Oreschak, Metro; 20 min)</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Flexible Funds Allocation: Step 2 (Grace Cho, Metro; 30 min)</li> <li>• Comprehensive Climate Action Plan: greenhouse gas inventory and targets (Eliot Rose, Metro; 30 min)</li> <li>• Oregon Transportation Survey (in packet)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Federal Surface Transportation Reauthorization regional priorities (draft discussion)</li> <li>• Regional TDM Strategy Update</li> <li>• RFFA Step 1A: Bond discussion (HOLD)</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>July 17, 2025- in person</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual Transit Budget Updates (comment)</li> <li>• State Legislative Update (Anneliese Koehler, 10 min)</li> <li>• Montgomery Park LPA Adoption (<b>action</b>)</li> <li>• RFFA Step 1A Bond (<b>action</b>)</li> <li>• Federal Surface Transportation Reauthorization regional priorities (action)</li> <li>• Comprehensive Climate Action Plan: greenhouse gas inventory and targets (Eliot Rose, Metro; 30 min)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>August- cancelled</u></b></p>
<p><b><u>September 18, 2025- online</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit project; Possible RTP amendment</li> <li>• TV Highway LPA Discussion</li> <li>• Cooling Corridors</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>October 16, 2025- in person</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TV Highway (action)</li> <li>• JPACT trip report back</li> <li>• CCT Study: Priorities</li> <li>• Hold for IBR LUFO</li> </ul> <p>MPACT- October 25<sup>th</sup></p>
<p><b><u>November 20, 2025- online</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>December 18, 2025- in person</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SS4A Annual update</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

***Holding Tank:***

- Better Bus Program update

# 2025 MPAC Work Plan

Updated 1/8/25

<p><b><u>January 22, 2025- online</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of the December 11, 2024 MPAC Meeting Minutes (consent)</li> <li>• MPAC Leadership Action (Commissioner Treece, MPAC Chair; 10 min)</li> <li>• Cooling Corridors (Andre Lightsey-Walker, Metro; 30 min)</li> <li>• Follow up on UGB process (Eryn Kehe, Metro; 30 min)</li> </ul> <p>Send by Jan 31<sup>st</sup>- Annual compliance Report</p>	<p><b><u>February 26, 2025- online</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MPAC intro/workplan review (Malu Wilkinson, Metro; 30 min)</li> <li>• 82nd Avenue Transit Plan LPA (Melissa Ashbaugh; 30 min)</li> <li>• Future Vision: Scoping and workplan (Jess Zdeb, Metro; 30 min)</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>March 19, 2025- in person</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Housing Coordination Strategy - scope of work and engagement plan (Emily Lieb and Eryn Kehe, Metro; 45 min)</li> <li>• Comprehensive Climate Action Plan: greenhouse gas inventory and targets (Eliot Rose, Metro; 30 min)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>April 23, 2025- online</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Funding Update</li> <li>• Community Connections Transit Study</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>May 28, 2025-online</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue LPA (action)</li> <li>• Regional Housing Coordination Strategy - engagement themes; categories of preliminary list of strategies (Emily Lieb and Eryn Kehe, Metro; 45 min)</li> <li>• CPRG</li> <li>• Montgomery Park Streetcar LPA discussion (Alex Oreschak, Metro; 30 min)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>June 25, 2025- in person</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooling Corridors</li> <li>• Future Vision</li> <li>• Housing Funding Update</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>July 23, 2025- online</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Montgomery Park Streetcar LPA (action)</li> <li>• CPRG</li> <li>• Future Vision</li> <li>• State Legislative Update</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>August 27, 2025 cancelled</u></b></p>

## Memorandum

**To:** C4 Metro Subcommittee

**From:** Karen Buehrig and Jeff Owen – Clackamas County; Will Farley – City of Lake Oswego

**Re:** Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA): Step 1 and Step 2 Updates

**Date:** February 13, 2025

---

### **Purpose:**

To provide C4Metro an update on the process for the Step 1A.1 and Step 2 funding programs within the Metro administered Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA). These two funding mechanisms are distinct and separate but are linked together in the same program of funds.

### **RFFA Background and Funding Sources:**

In April of 2024, Metro staff provided C4 Metro an overview and background of the 2028-2030 RFFA process. At that time, they shared that every three years, Metro leads a process to allocate regional flexible funds – money from the federal government that can be used for a wide range of transportation projects across the region, including improvements to a roadway or street, a trail connection or sidewalk gap. These funds come from two federal grant programs: 1) Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds may be used for transportation projects to preserve and improve conditions and performance on public roads, transit capital, on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities and environmental mitigation. 2) Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality program (CMAQ) funds may be used for transportation projects and other related efforts that contribute to better air quality and reduce the emissions of harmful pollutants and provide traffic congestion relief.

In the C4 Metro's May meeting packet, there were responses from Metro on specific questions C4 Metro members had about the RFFA program direction. The C4 Metro Committee had an opportunity to discuss the RFFA program direction that was scheduled for JPACT recommendation in June.

### **RFFA Adopted Program Direction Summary:**

In June 2024, Metro Council approved a program direction for the Regional Flexible Fund Allocation for the upcoming cycle during 2028-2030. The program's direction builds upon previous RFFA policy established by JPACT and Metro Council and continues the two-step funding approach which 1) directs funding towards region-wide investments and 2) supports construction of capital projects in specific focus areas.

Funding allocated in Step 1 represents the region's ongoing commitments to fund portions of the transportation system that are critical to following through on RTP-identified goals and objectives. Step 1 is represented by two components: Step 1A represents the region's commitment to repay bonds used to build portions of the region's transit system; Step 1B represents investments to support transportation programs and planning activities coordinated region wide. These programs and planning activities advance federal, state, and regional

requirements for building a multi-modal transportation system, meeting federal air quality regulations, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles, per mandates from the state.

Funding allocated in Step 2 is for local capital projects with regional impacts, maintains the single capital projects category and focuses on projects that improve the system in multiple ways. More information can be found in the adopted RFFA Program Direction.

Metro staff returned to C4 Metro in July, providing the committee with an update on the RFFA program and the anticipated next steps. Details about the new project bond development process were shared and an overview of the anticipated schedule was provided.

In September, county and city staff provided an overview of the projects that were submitted for the Step 1A.1 funds and talk about the projects that were expected to be submitted for Step 2 funds.

### **RFFA Step 1 Updates:**

As part of the adoption of the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Program Direction, JPACT and the Metro Council agreed to move forward in the development of a new project bond proposal (also referred to as Step 1A.1) for consideration by the region.

Past decisions on RFFA committed future Regional Flexible Fund dollars to project bond repayment in effort to advance financial resources to delivery larger capital projects earlier and capitalize on federal funding opportunities. As a result, the region remains committed to bond repayment through 2034 for transit and project development. For the 2028-2030 timeframe, the region's scheduled bond repayments are \$51.78 million in total, which is a decrease from the 2025-2027 RFFA timeframe where the total scheduled bond repayments are \$65.28 million. The net difference between the two RFFA cycles is \$13.5 million newly unencumbered towards project bond repayments. Recognizing the transportation needs of the region, the increased funding capacity starting in 2028 opened a discussion as to whether the region should consider a new project bond commitment of Regional Flexible Funds to implement regional or corridor scale projects to advance Regional Transportation Plan goals and outcomes.

Over the course of the 2028-2030 RFFA program direction development, input and feedback from regional partners indicated a desire to pursue a new project bond in exchange for committing future Regional Flexible Funds. Regional and/or corridor-scale projects to be supported through the new project bond must be one or more of the following project types:

- Capital Investment Grants (CIG) projects or transit projects leveraging other federal funding: Regional contribution to funding plans of existing priority projects; Next Corridor funding.
- First/last mile transit investments: include safe access to transit.
- Transit vehicle priority investments, such as Better Bus or transit signal priority improvements

Project nominations were submitted to Metro from around the region in October 2024. Metro evaluated all nine transit projects in contention, gathered input towards concepts/themes,

shared initial bond scenarios, and most recently have shared financially constrained final bond scenarios for consideration and discussion to soon arrive at a preferred bond scenario.

Eight scenarios are being evaluated by Metro and discussed by TPAC to explore the potential benefits of inclusion in a new bond. The types of feedback provided by TPAC regarding the scenarios is summarized into the following themes:

- Support for a comprehensive approach, project selection and geographic balance
- Ensure minimum funding levels for key projects
- Financial Strategy and Risk Mitigation
- Scenario refinements and additional data needs

Pasted below is a snapshot image of the eight scenarios, with additional information contained in the following memo to JPACT. The preferred bond scenario will be shared widely for public comment from late March and into April.

**Requested Step 1 Discussion:**

C4Metro has an opportunity to discuss outcomes that are important and other guidance to help inform the JPACT discussion on February 20 and next steps in the process.

*Table 1. Bond Scenarios*

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	Scenario 6	Scenario 7	Scenario 8
		Regional-Corridor Scale Balancing 5 Theme Areas							
		Low Allocation	Max Allocation	Mid-High Allocation	Mid-High Allocation	Regionally Distributed	Major Leverage	FX Only	CIG Only
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$25M	\$27.5	\$25M	\$25M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$25M	\$27.5	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$6.5M	\$9M	\$13M	\$6.5M	\$15M	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$6M	\$10M	\$7M	\$5M	\$ -	\$10M	\$ -	\$ -
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$7.5M	\$10M	\$7.5M	\$15M	\$ -	\$10M	\$ -	\$20M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$70M</b>	<b>\$84M</b>	<b>\$82.5M</b>	<b>\$81.5M</b>	<b>\$75M</b>	<b>\$80M</b>	<b>\$60M</b>	<b>\$80M</b>

See Attachment 3 for further description and rationale of the project allocation levels according to bond scenario.

## **RFFA Step 2 Updates:**

The 2028-2030 RFFA program direction retains a previous single Step 2 capital project category and maintains the same focus on local projects with regional impact that improve the region's active transportation network and supporting freight mobility and economic outcomes. Step 2 project submittals were due in fall 2024 and have been evaluated by Metro according to the adopted 2028-2030 RFFA Program Direction.

From within Clackamas County, partners submitted a total of six projects this cycle:

1. Clackamas County: SE Jennifer Multi-Use Path. Request: \$ 7,228,290.
2. Gladstone: Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction. Request: \$ 8,722,000.
3. Happy Valley: Rock Creek Junction Reconfiguration. Request: \$ 12,026,118.
4. Lake Oswego: Lakeview Blvd. Request: \$ 112,500.
5. Milwaukie: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path. Request: \$ 2,707,217.
6. Oregon City: OR99E McLoughlin Boulevard. Request: \$ 3,927,917.

Attached are two-pager fact sheets on each of the six submitted projects. The total amount of project requests from around the region far exceeds the anticipated total funding available for Step 2 awards. As such, there is a potential opportunity for each regional Coordinating Committee to provide a prioritization of the project submittals in May 2025.

## **Requested Step 2 Discussion:**

Currently, C4Metro has an opportunity to learn more about each of the six submittals and begin to provide directions on what additional information would be helpful to consider any potential prioritization. If needed, CTAC can be of assistance to coordinate and evaluate project submittals based on C4/C4Metro direction.

## **Upcoming Calendar Opportunities Related to RFFA Step 1 and 2:**

The following calendar items are related to RFFA and opportunities for input:

- February 20, 2025: JPACT is expected to discuss a Step 1A.1 New Project Bond Revised Scenario Assessment.
- March 7, 2025: TPAC will discuss 1) a Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Selection of Preferred Scenario/Proposal Fund, and 2) Step 2 – Risk Assessment Results and Next Steps.
- March 19: C4Metro opportunity to learn about Step 2 Risk Assessment Results and further discuss RFFA topics.
- March 20, 2025: JPACT is expected to discuss a RFFA Recommendation for public comment which will include a preferred scenario for Step 1A.1 New Bond projects and all of the projects submitted for Step 2.
- May 14, 2025: C4 Metro overview of public comments on project submittals and discussion on Coordinating Committee comment letter.

# Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) Updates

Meeting dates	Details
April 2024	Metro staff provided C4 Metro an overview and background of the 2028-2030 RFFA process.
May 2024	Metro responses on specific C4 Metro members questions on the RFFA program direction. Discussion of the RFFA program direction for input in June JPACT meeting
July 2024	Metro staff to updated on the new project bond development process and schedule overview
Sept 2024	County and city staff provided overview of submitted Step 1A.1 projects discussion of the projects that were expected to be submitted for Step 2 funds.

# Step 1 A.1 New Project Bond

Regional and/or corridor-scale projects to be supported through the new project bond must be one or more of the following project types:

- Capital Investment Grants (CIG) projects or transit projects leveraging other federal funding: Regional contribution to funding plans of existing priority projects; Next Corridor funding.
- First/last mile transit investments: include safe access to transit.
- Transit vehicle priority investments, such as Better Bus or transit signal priority improvements

# New Bond Scenarios

- ❖ Eight (8) Financially Constrained Bond Scenarios
- ❖ Allocation ranges from \$60 - \$84 million
- ❖ Reductions based on scope assumptions Scenario Concepts
  - Scenarios 1 – 4: Regional and corridor scale investments balance bond performance goals
  - Scenario 5: Geographic distribution around the region
  - Scenario 6: Potential to leverage significant amounts of identified funding sources
  - Scenario 7 and 8: Transit capital specific projects by mode and federal funding source

# New Bond Scenarios

28-30 RFFA STEP 1A.1 – BOND SCENARIOS AND RESULTS

FEBRUARY 13, 2025

*Table 1. Bond Scenarios*

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	Scenario 6	Scenario 7	Scenario 8
		Regional-Corridor Scale Balancing 5 Theme Areas							
		Low Allocation	Max Allocation	Mid-High Allocation	Mid-High Allocation	Regionally Distributed	Major Leverage	FX Only	CIG Only
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$25M	\$27.5	\$25M	\$25M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$25M	\$27.5	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$6.5M	\$9M	\$13M	\$6.5M	\$15M	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$6M	\$10M	\$7M	\$5M	\$ -	\$10M	\$ -	\$ -
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$7.5M	\$10M	\$7.5M	\$15M	\$ -	\$10M	\$ -	\$20M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$70M</b>	<b>\$84M</b>	<b>\$82.5M</b>	<b>\$81.5M</b>	<b>\$75M</b>	<b>\$80M</b>	<b>\$60M</b>	<b>\$80M</b>

See Attachment 3 for further description and rationale of the project allocation levels according to bond scenario.

# TPAC Input

- Support for a comprehensive approach, project selection and geographic balance
- Ensure minimum funding levels for key projects
- Financial Strategy and Risk Mitigation
- Scenario refinements and additional data needs

# Discussion – Step 1 A.1

At JPACT, they will be asking for thoughts or input regarding the two differing directions to bond package options:

- A bond proposal which reflects a diversified transit investment types and are spread across the region; or
- A bond proposal focusing on transit projects in position to leverage federal Capital Investments Grant (CIG) funds.

Any further direction in shaping the bond proposal package to bring forward?

# Step 2 Projects

Step 2 project submittals were due in fall 2024 and have been evaluated by Metro according to the adopted 2028-2030 RFFA Program Direction.

- Clackamas County: SE Jennifer Multi-Use Path. Request: \$ 7,228,290.
- Gladstone: Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction. Request: \$ 8,722,000.
- Happy Valley: Rock Creek Junction Reconfiguration. Request: \$ 12,026,118.
- Lake Oswego: Lakeview Blvd. Request: \$ 112,500.
- Milwaukie: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path. Request: \$ 2,707,217.
- Oregon City: OR99E McLoughlin Boulevard. Request: \$ 3,927,917.

# Next Steps

Meeting dates	Details
February 2025	JPACT discussion of Step 1A.1 New Project Bond Revised Scenario Assessment.
March 2025	March 7, 2025: TPAC discussion of Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Selection of Preferred Scenario/Proposal Fund, and Step 2 – Risk Assessment Results and Next Steps. March 19: C4 Metro opportunity hear Step 2 Risk Assessment Results and discuss RFFA topics. March 20, 2025: JPACT discuss a projects for public comment
March 24- April 28 2025	Public Comment period open for RFFA projects; Public Hearing/Testimony opportunity
May 2025	C4 Metro overview of public comments on project submittals and discussion on Coordinating Committee comment letter



# Memo

Date: Thursday, February 13, 2025  
To: Joint Policy Alternatives Committee on Transportation and Interested Parties  
From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner  
Jean Senechal Biggs, Resource Development Section Manager  
Ted Leybold, Transportation Policy Director  
Subject: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 – Revised Bond Scenarios and Results

---

**Purpose:** To provide an overview of the bond scenarios for the Step 1A.1 new project bond and to gather direction on shaping a staff recommendation of a preferred bond scenario/proposal to bring forward to the March 2025 committee meetings.

### **Request for JPACT Discussion and Input:**

TPAC met on February 7<sup>th</sup> and discussed the eight Step 1A.1 bond scenarios ranging between \$60 million and \$84 million. (See Table 1.)

Based on TPAC's feedback, two different directions are emerging for a preferred bond proposal for regional consideration:

- A bond proposal which reflects a diversified transit investment types and are spread across the region; or
- A bond proposal focusing on transit projects in position to leverage federal Capital Investments Grant (CIG) funds.

Metro staff are initiating follow-up conversations with staff from each of the nominating agencies to clarify scope and budget assumptions at different allocation levels, as well as seek input towards the refinement of the bond proposal, in advance of the March 2025 TPAC and JPACT meetings.

Metro staff seek input from JPACT members to guide the refinement of the bond proposal, including answers to the following questions:

- Any further thoughts or input regarding these two differing directions to bond package options?
- Any further direction in shaping the bond proposal package to bring forward at the March meeting?

### **Background & Current Place in Development:**

As part of the adoption of the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Program Direction, JPACT and the Metro Council agreed to move forward in the development of a new project bond proposal (also referred to as Step 1A.1) for consideration by the region.

After evaluating the nine transit projects proposed by partner agencies, gathering input towards concepts/themes, and sharing initial bond scenarios, the following materials present eight financially constrained revised bond scenarios for consideration and discussion.

### **Getting to Bond Scenarios**

At the January 2025 meetings of TPAC and JPACT, and at a Metro Council work session, Metro staff gathered reactions to the initial bond scenarios and proposed an approach to finalize them.

Regional partners and Council responded with varying input on the approach, as well as initial impressions. A summary of what was heard is included in Attachment 1.

Metro staff moved forward with an approach that balanced scenario performance across the five themes of: maximized RTP outcomes, leveraging funds, categorical representation/diversified investment, regional or corridor scale, and readiness. However, regional partners advocated for one or more of three themes requiring a higher threshold of performance for a final bond proposal for regional consideration. These themes are:

- Leveraging of other funding opportunities to multiply the effects of the investment
- Honor the deliberation by JPACT to expand bonding for other types of transit projects beyond high capacity transit by having the three transit project categories represented.
- Ensuring investments are made throughout the metropolitan region.

Applying the three themes, the Program Direction principles, and the balanced performance approach, Metro staff narrowed the pool of candidate projects from nine projects to five projects for the bond scenarios. The five candidate projects emphasize regional or large corridor scale impact and performed well among their respective nomination category in the five main themes regional partners expressed were critical for the bond scenarios. Listed below are the five candidate projects incorporated into the bond scenarios:

- 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit Project
- Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway Transit Project
- Sunrise Gateway Corridor Project
- Burnside Bridge Transit Vehicle Priority and Access to Transit Elements
- Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension

Attachment 2 details the rationales for moving these five candidate projects forward, as well as the rationales for the remaining four candidate projects removed from consideration.

### **Revised Bond Scenarios Overview**

The revised bond scenarios are built around the five candidate projects. Metro's financial analysis determined that the maximum amount the new bond can support is up to \$84 million.

Each individual scenario balances RTP performance goals while maintaining fiscal constraint and largely adhering to the Program Direction principles for the bond. The scenarios differ in how they emphasize specific themes, proceeds allocation levels for the scenarios, and regional partners input.

In total, there are eight revised bond scenarios (Table 1) organized around four main concepts:

- Bond Scenarios 1 – 4: Regional and corridor scale investments balance bond performance goals with varying scope and allocation emphasis.
- Bond Scenario 5: Geographic distribution around the region.
- Bond Scenario 6: Potential to leverage significant amounts of identified funding sources.
- Bond Scenario 7 and 8: Transit-specific projects by mode and federal funding source.

A summary of the bond scenario analysis results for the five themes is outlined in Attachment 3. Attachment 3 draws from the candidate project technical evaluation results and factors in allocation levels for the individual candidate projects in each scenario. Attachment 3 includes one-page summaries of each of the eight bond scenario with further detail.

**Project Allocation Reductions in Bond Scenarios**

To maintain financial constraint, the bond scenarios assume a single bond mechanism with a maximum of up to \$84 million available in bond proceeds while maintaining the Program Direction principles. With the combined bond proceeds request of the five candidate projects totaling \$120 million, in most scenarios individual candidate projects bond proceeds requests are not fully met.

Attachment 3 outlines the different allocation levels by project and summary of rationale. The rationale behind the allocation level for the individual candidate projects and different bond scenarios were developed by Metro staff and based on review of the candidate project's application materials. The approach was to estimate which scope elements can be completed at allocation levels under the fully requested amount. The allocation levels were not verified with the nominating agency and therefore the potential amounts in each scenario may not accurately reflect what can get accomplished with a lesser allocation of bond proceeds.

Nominating agencies expressed a desire to work with Metro staff to refine and determine possible bond allocation levels for the bond scenarios reflective of achieving scope elements. Metro staff are initiating follow-up conversations with staff from each of the nominating agencies to clarify scope assumptions according to allocation levels, as well as seek input towards the refinement of the bond proposal package, in advance of the March 2025 TPAC and JPACT meetings.

*Table 1. Bond Scenarios*

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Scenario 5	Scenario 6	Scenario 7	Scenario 8
		Regional-Corridor Scale Balancing 5 Theme Areas							
		Low Allocation	Max Allocation	Mid-High Allocation	Mid-High Allocation				
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$25M	\$27.5	\$25M	\$25M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$25M	\$27.5	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$6.5M	\$9M	\$13M	\$6.5M	\$15M	\$-	\$-	\$-
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$6M	\$10M	\$7M	\$5M	\$-	\$10M	\$-	\$-
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$7.5M	\$10M	\$7.5M	\$15M	\$-	\$10M	\$-	\$20M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$70M</b>	<b>\$84M</b>	<b>\$82.5M</b>	<b>\$81.5M</b>	<b>\$75M</b>	<b>\$80M</b>	<b>\$60M</b>	<b>\$80M</b>

See Attachment 3 for further description and rationale of the project allocation levels according to bond scenario.

### **TPAC Input on Bond Scenarios**

TPAC comments on the bond scenarios can largely be grouped among the following types of comments: 1) general Regional Flexible Fund bond comments; 2) bond scenario comments; 3) additional information regional partners would like to see; and 4) project specific comments. The comments are listed according to the grouping.

Where possible additional information TPAC members requested is noted or incorporated into the JPACT materials, however, Metro staff was unable to accommodate the request by the nominating agencies to meet and revise scenarios prior to the JPACT materials mailing.

#### **General Regional Flexible Fund Bond Comments**

- Considering whether to move forward with a bond remains as a question to confirm with regional leaders.
- Provide a clear picture to JPACT the impacts of the Regional Flexible Fund bonding decision on both the current (28-30) and future Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 allocations.
  - Share the information that under the current estimates with a max bond the Step 2 program for the current allocation is in line with previous allocations.
- Considering the state legislative session is now in session, a preferred bond scenario should reflect a unified region and help make the case for leveraging potential state funding. Knowing that, consideration of the regional impact of the investment rather than the location of the investment itself should be factor in shaping the bond proposal.

#### **Bond Scenario Comments**

- Preference and desire to allocate and maximize the full available amount of bond proceeds in efforts to advance the region’s transportation objectives.
- Consider a delayed decision or an approach in staggering the issuance of bonds to help mitigate for risks in a changing funding landscape.
- Preference for bond scenarios which reflect all three transit categories (e.g. transit capital, transit vehicle priority, access to transit).
  - Continue to invest in a broad array of projects which advance transit.
  - Create a new type of pipeline for different types of transit projects.
- Preference for bond scenarios which focus on transit capital investments.
  - Furthermore, preference for funding candidate projects at their full funding requests in an effort to discourage spreading the proceeds to widely to the extent the candidate project is unable to deliver what it intended with bond proceeds.
- Preference that the preferred bond scenario strongly reflects the advancing the goals outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan.
- A desire to see a new bond scenario which considers a \$84M bond allocation split between the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit and Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway Transit projects with \$42 million towards each project.
- A desire to see a new bond scenario which reflects a proportion allocation to all five candidate projects with the Capital Investment Grant projects receiving the majority of the bond proceeds.

#### **Additional Information**

- Request to see information for each of the candidate projects in contention on how the bond proceeds fits into the overall funding strategy for the project.

#### **Project Specific Comments**

- For the bond proceeds, the eastbound rose lane on the new Burnside Bridge is the priority element and it is the one transit vehicle priority candidate projects in consideration. To make that successful, the Burnside Bridge project needs a minimum of \$15 million in bond proceeds to support the new bus dwell area on the west side of the bridge and the right-of-way for new rose land.
- The Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway Transit Project cannot support a reduction in the requested \$30 million, as it is the minimum in regional contribution of matching funds needed for the project's Capital Investment Grant application. The Sunrise Gateway Corridor project believes the estimated cost to achieve 30% design (Scenario 2) and 60% design (Scenario 3) are higher than proposed in the bond scenarios and would need to receive a higher bond proceeds allocation.

### **Bond Scenarios & Step 2 Implications**

For the purposes of the bond scenarios Metro assumed use of a single bond mechanism to frame the top end of what a new project bond starting with the 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation cycle can support. While maintaining assumptions the bond proceeds availability and annual debt serving schedule remains within the financial principles of the Program Direction, the effect of a new bond topped at \$84 million will result in a Step 2 allocation near \$42M starting in 28-30. A new project bond drawing down less proceeds will likely result in a Step 2 closer to or slightly greater than \$45 million. For the future funding cycles, the revenue available for Step 2 are forecasts based on historical trends. With that information, it is likely the 31-33 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 allocation will be the most financially constrained as it will be the cycle with peak debt servicing and the bond proceeds will have been distributed and expended by this time.

A Step 2 allocation in the mid-\$30 to mid-\$40 million range is not uncommon. Previous cycles allocation of Step 2 were the following:

- 25-27 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 cycle allocated \$47.4 million.
- 22-24 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 cycle allocated \$45 million
- 19-21 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 cycle allocated \$34 million

These Step 2 allocations in these funding cycles were with debt service at its peak under existing bonds between \$65 through a little over \$67 million over the three years.

With a federal transportation authorization secure only through 2026 and a shifting federal landscape, the ability to secure federal funds for the proposed bond projects is uncertain. The option to not pursue a bond is an option that JPACT could consider following the public comment period. If the region elects to forego a bond in the 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund cycle, then the allocation for Step 2 increases somewhere between \$55 to \$60 million based on revenue forecasts to date.

### **Bond Mechanism Update**

At the January 2025 TPAC meeting, Metro staff provided information on the different bond mechanism options and an updated estimate as to what a new project bond in the 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation can support. Information was presented on two specific bond mechanism options: 1) a single bond mechanism; and 2) multiple bond mechanism. Metro staff at this time has not selected a bond mechanism to move forward with in part because the mechanism will depend on the project composition of the preferred bond scenario package. However, based on Metro staff's analysis, the multiple bond mechanism option would likely necessitate going through the federal bonding programs, which staff assessment determined are not cost effective and a new project bond would not be worth pursuing at the cost level.

Metro staff continue to research further into the single bond mechanism option and the bond scenarios discussion will continue to assume proceeds amounts through a single bond. Depending on the outcome of the region’s selected preferred bond scenario, to get to a single bond mechanism to support all the projects identified it may necessitate a local fund exchange. Discussion with entities to support fund exchange are on-going. Metro will explore the bond mechanism in earnest after the action in March once a preferred bond scenario is selected.

### **Next Steps – 2028-2030 RFFA – New Project Bond Development Process**

Table 2. outlines the next steps in the 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 New Project Bond development process. To date, the bond development process remains on track to converge with the Step 2 allocation process in the public comment in March 2025.

*Table 2. 2028-2030 RFFA – New Project Bond Development – Key Dates*

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
First draft bond scenarios and reference scenarios released	January 10 & 16, 2025
Second draft bond scenarios with financial assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather regional partner input to identify a preferred bond scenario</li> </ul>	February 7 & 20, 2025
Request action to release recommended preferred bond scenario/proposal (TPAC and JPACT)	March 7 & 20, 2025
2028-2030 RFFA public comment opens	March 24, 2025
2028-2030 RFFA public hearing/testimony	April 17, 2025*
2028-2030 RFFA public comment closes	April 28, 2025
Summary of 2028-2030 RFFA public comments with responses and draft/tentative staff recommendations for refinements to TPAC & JPACT (if needed)	May 2 & 15, 2025*
TPAC and JPACT opportunity to deliberate input received on preferred bond scenario and finalize the preferred bond proposal	June 2025
TPAC and JPACT action on 2028-2030 RFFA including the preferred bond proposal (Step 1A.1) and Step 2	July 2025

\*Indicates tentative date. Unconfirmed on committee or Metro Council calendars or delivery date project work is on the aggressive side and may change.

## Attachment 1 – Summary Input on Initial Bond Scenarios

At the January 2025 meetings of TPAC, JPACT, and at Metro Council work session, Metro staff gathered reactions to the initial bond scenarios placed forward. The analysis of the initial bond scenarios indicated maximizing performance according to an individual theme partners desire to have a bond built around results in no one bond scenario being able to meet all the Program Direction objectives. At this same time, regional partners and Council also received an updated financial picture, limiting the bond to upwards of \$84 million dollars in proceeds while maintaining the outlined financial principles in the Program Direction. With this information in mind, regional partners and Council responded with varying input. The summary of what was heard included the following:

### TPAC and JPACT

- Continue to move forwards with the bond proposal despite unknowns.
  - Consider the purchasing power of funds in hand today versus in the future.
  - There remains an appetite in the region to “do big things” and advance regional objectives.
- Bonding is expensive; make it worth it.
  - Prioritize leveraging of discretionary funding.
  - Recognize bonding as a tool for local match and being more competitive in discretionary processes.
- Make impactful investment across the region.
- Consider opportunity costs.
  - What would get accomplished in the bonding timeframe?
  - Will dollars be less valuable in the future?
- Ensure bonding results in community benefits.
  - Center the bond on racial equity.
  - Utilize the bond opportunity to advance regional workforce initiatives.
- Consider the opportunity for applicants to scale requests.

### Metro Council

- Keep the region poised to take advantage of opportunities.
  - Continue to move forward with the bond process and prepare for opportunities.
- Bonding comes at a premium.
  - Acknowledge the fiduciary responsibilities and decision.
- The decision to bond will have long term effects to Regional Flexible Fund Allocation.
  - Reduction in available Step 2 funds through 2039.
- Assess for racial equity advancement.

## Attachment 2. Rationales for the Candidate Projects Consideration in Bond Scenarios

Table 1 provides the detail of five candidate projects rationale for their selection in building the final bond scenarios.

*Table 1. Final Bond Scenario Candidate Projects and Rationale*

<i>Candidate Project</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
82 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit Project	Overall meets bond purpose and principles from Program Direction. Additional considerations of leverage, readiness, RTP outcomes advancement, and advancement of racial equity outcomes.
Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	Overall meets bond purpose and principles from Program Direction. Additional considerations of leverage, readiness, RTP outcomes advancement, and advancement of racial equity outcomes.
Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	Overall meets bond purpose and principles from Program Direction. Additional considerations of leverage, readiness, RTP outcomes advancement, and land use-housing opportunities.
Burnside Bridge Transit Access and Vehicle Priority Project	Meets several bond purpose and principles from Program Direction. Additional considerations for resiliency factor, local funding commitment, RTP outcomes advancement. Funding strategy remains higher risk.
Sunrise Gateway Corridor Project	Meets some bond purpose and principles. Additional considerations for project indicated as the Clackamas County priority. Regional in scale of potential impact.

Note: Candidate projects are listed by nominating category order.

While each candidate project demonstrated strengths consistent with the Program Direction principles for bond proceeds consideration, four candidate projects are not included in the finalized bond scenarios. Table 2. identifies the remaining four candidate projects and their individual rationale for no longer moving forward in the final bond scenarios.

*Table 2. Candidate Projects Not Included in Final Bond Scenarios and Rationale*

<i>Candidate Project</i>	<i>Rationale</i>
185 <sup>th</sup> MAX Overcrossing Project	Comparatively, not of regional-corridor scale. Regional input reflects desired emphasis to focus on construction and seeing project completed. Funding leverage potential is high, but concern for funding strategy being an unknown in the region.
Better Bus Program	Input received is to consider for a Step 1B regional program in either the current or future Regional Flexible Fund cycle. To date, ability to leverage discretionary funding remains unclear.
OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard)	Comparatively, mid-size in regional-corridor scale and of potential impact. Less competitive compared to other candidate projects on ability to leverage funds.
72 <sup>nd</sup> Avenue Phase I Tigard Triangle	Comparatively, mid-size in regional-corridor scale and of potential impact. Less competitive compared to other candidate projects on ability to leverage funds. Comparatively, less impactful towards advancing regional outcomes.

Note: Candidate projects are listed by nominating category order.

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

*Table. 1 Project Allocations Reflected in Bond Scenarios*

Project Name	<b>82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit Project</b>
Requested	\$30M
Description	Matching funds for the project’s Capital Investment Grant application. Funds applied as match to construction activities.
Bond Proceeds Purpose	Local contribution of matching funds for project construction.
Allocation Amounts and Rationales	\$25M - \$30M; Assumes the project can identify and secure other matching funds to address project allocations which are less than the full request.
Project Name	<b>Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway Transit Project</b>
Requested	\$30M
Description	Matching funds for the project’s Capital Investment Grant application. Funds applied as match to construction activities.
Bond Proceeds Purpose	Local contribution of matching funds for project construction.
Allocation Amounts and Rationales	\$25M - \$30M; Assumes the project can identify and secure other matching funds to address project allocations which are less than the full request.
Project Name	<b>Sunrise Gateway Corridor</b>
Requested	\$15M
Description	Funds to support the NEPA re-evaluation of the Sunrise Gateway project and project development activities through 100% design for a mix of local circulation, active transportation, and transit hub enhancements on Highway 212 between 122nd to 172nd with a focus between 135th and 152nd.
Bond Proceed Purpose	Initiate design of one of the major capital projects from the Sunrise Corridor Community Visioning .
Allocation Amounts and Rationales	\$6.5M - \$15M; Assumes the project can meet certain design package milestones (30%, 60% and 100%) at different allocation levels. Allocations under the full request also assume NEPA re-evaluation funded outside of bond proceeds.
Project Name	<b>Burnside Bridge Transit Vehicle Priority and Pedestrian Access to Transit Elements</b>
Requested	\$25M
Description	Funds to support a mix of transit vehicle priority and pedestrian access to transit elements of the new earthquake ready Burnside Bridge. Elements include a bus dwell area on the west side of the bridge, realignment of NE Couch, additional right-of-way for the eastbound bus only lane, new transit stops, and access to transit detours during the project construction.
Bond Proceed Purpose	Local contribution to the project.
Allocation Amounts and Rationales	\$5M - \$10M; Assumes specific scope elements funded according to allocation amount. In most scenarios a mix of one transit vehicle priority and one pedestrian access to transit scope element assumed.
Project Name	<b>Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension</b>
Requested	\$20M
Description	Matching funds for the project’s Capital Investment Grant application. Funds applied as match to construction activities.
Bond Proceed Purpose	Local contribution of matching funds for project construction.
Allocation Amounts and Rationales	\$7.5M - \$10M; Assumes the project can identify and secure other matching funds to address project allocations which are less than the full request. Allocation levels based on estimates for right-of-way and construction services work.

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

*Table 2. Bond Scenario Performance Summary*

Scenario	Total	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Category Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
1 – Low Allocation	\$70M	Better	Good	Yes	Yes	Good
2 – Max Allocation	\$84M	Better	Better	Yes	Yes	Good
3 – Strategic Advancement	\$82.5M	Better	Better	Yes	Yes	Better
4 – Bond Risk	\$81.5M	Better	Better	Yes	Yes	Good
5 – Regionally Distributed	\$75M	Good	Good	No*	Yes	Good
6 – Major Leverage	\$80M	Best	Best	Yes	Partial	Better
7 – FX Only	\$60M	Best	Best	No*	Partial	Better
8 – CIG Only	\$80M	Best	Best	No*	Partial	Better

\* Scope of work for the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Tualatin Valley Highway Transit projects include elements of transit vehicle priority and safe access to transit within the project scopes.

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best

Categorical Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 1: Regional-Corridor Balanced Performance – Low Allocation

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$25M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$25M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$6.5M
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$6M
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$7.5M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$70M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 1 centers on two overarching factors: 1) maintaining balanced maximum performance across the five themes; and 2) conservative bond proceed allocation at a level of less risk to future allocations of Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B. No candidate project receives full request of bond proceeds. Allocations based on project cost estimate descriptions.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is \$5M less than TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is \$5M less than TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Sunrise: Proposed allocation assumes cost to reach 30% design. NEPA re-evaluation excluded.

Burnside: Proposed allocation is for one vehicle priority and one pedestrian element in scope.

Montgomery Park: Proposed allocation is for approximately half of the estimated costs for land purchases and right-of-way acquisition, towards matching funds contribution for CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Invests across all five candidate projects, represents different transit investment types, and investment distributed across the metropolitan region. Greater investment of bond proceeds towards in higher performing candidate projects for funding leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes, with strategic investment in regionally significant projects for future readiness. Most proceeds are towards construction activities.

##### Risks

No candidate receives full requested amount. Assumes candidate project sponsor can secure additional matching funds to complete proposed scope of work. Possibility for some candidate projects to struggle to complete the scope proposed with partial funding. Trade off in performance and debt repayment if candidate projects cannot advance.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorial Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Better	Good	Yes	Yes	Good

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
Categorial Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 2: Regional-Corridor Balanced Performance – Max Allocation

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$27.5
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$27.5
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$9M
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$10M
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$10M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$84M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 2 centers on two overarching factors: 1) maintaining balanced maximum performance across the five themes; and 2) maximizing bond proceed allocation to advance regional objectives. Even with increased allocated bond proceeds, no candidate project receives full request. Allocation reductions based on project cost estimate descriptions.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is \$2.5M less than TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is \$2.5M less than TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Sunrise: Proposed allocation assumes cost to reach 60% design. NEPA re-evaluation excluded.

Burnside: Proposed allocation is for one vehicle priority and all pedestrian elements in scope.

Montgomery Park: Proposed allocation is for approximately half of construction professional services costs towards matching funds contribution for CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Invests across all five candidate projects, represents different transit investment types, and investment distributed across the metropolitan region. Allocations reach maximum amount of bond proceeds to advance all five candidates as far as possible while maintaining high performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Most proceeds are towards construction activities.

##### Risks

No candidate receives full requested amount. Assumes candidate project sponsor can secure additional matching funds to complete proposed scope of work. Possibility for some candidate projects to struggle to complete the scope proposed with partial funding. Trade off in performance and debt repayment if candidate projects cannot advance. Max allocation of available bond proceeds can present risks to Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorial Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Better	Better	Yes	Yes	Good

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
 Categorial Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 3: Regional-Corridor Balanced Performance – Mid-High Allocation 1

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$25M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$13M
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$7M
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$7.5M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$82.5M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 3 centers on two overarching factors: 1) maintaining balanced maximum performance across the five themes; and 2) strategically allocate bond proceeds to maximize candidate project ability to advance. One candidate receives full request while remaining candidates receive strategic level of bond proceeds to move forward. Allocation based on project cost estimate descriptions.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is \$5M less than TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Sunrise: Proposed allocation is for 100% design completion. NEPA re-evaluation excluded.

Burnside: Proposed allocation is for one vehicle priority and pedestrian elements in scope.

Montgomery Park: Proposed allocation is for approximately half of the estimate costs for land purchases and right-of-way towards matching funds contribution for CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Invests across all five candidate projects, represents different transit investment types, and investment distributed across the metropolitan region. Selective and strategic allocation of bond proceeds to advance all five candidates while maintaining high performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Most proceeds are towards construction activities.

##### Risks

Assumes candidate project sponsor can secure additional matching funds to complete proposed scope of work. Possibility for some candidate projects to struggle to complete the scope proposed with partial funding. Trade off in performance and debt repayment if candidate projects cannot advance. High allocation of available bond proceeds and can present risks to Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorial Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Better	Better	Yes	Yes	Better

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
 Categorial Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 4: Regional-Corridor Balanced Performance – Mid-High Allocation 2

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$25M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$6.5M
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$5M
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$15M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$81.5M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 4 centers on two overarching factors: 1) maintaining balanced maximum performance across the five themes; and 2) strategically allocate bond proceeds to minimize risks to the bond. One candidate receives full request while remaining candidates receive strategic level of bond proceeds based on funding strategy for completion. Allocation based on project cost estimate descriptions.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is \$5M less than TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Sunrise: Proposed allocation assumes cost to reach 30% design . NEPA re-evaluation excluded.

Burnside: Proposed allocation is for one vehicle priority and one pedestrian element in scope.

Montgomery Park: Proposed allocation is for approximately the full estimated costs for land purchases and right-of-way towards matching funds contribution for CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Invests across all five candidate projects, represents different transit investment types, and investment distributed across the metropolitan region. Selective and strategic allocation of bond proceeds to advance all five candidates, but with protected investment to candidate projects with greater secured funding strategies. Remains high performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Most proceeds are towards construction activities. Near even distribution between urban and suburban areas.

##### Risks

Assumes candidate project sponsor can secure additional matching funds to complete proposed scope of work. Possibility for some candidate projects to struggle to complete the scope proposed with partial funding. Trade off in performance and debt repayment if candidate projects cannot advance. High allocation of available bond proceeds and can present risks to Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorical Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Better	Better	Yes	Yes	Good

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
 Categorical Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 5: Regionally Distributed Allocation

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$15M
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$ -
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$ -
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$75M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 5 centers on simplified regional distribution of bond proceeds to advance regional objectives. Allocations of bond proceeds are for the full amount requested.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82nd Avenue: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution to construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested amount for Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Sunrise: Proposed allocation is for full requested funds, supporting the NEPA re-evaluation and 100% design for the local access and safety components on Highway 212.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Allocates a level of bond proceeds which places lesser risk pressure on Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 or Step 1B if revenue forecasts are less than anticipated. Medium to high performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Maintains geographic distribution of bond proceeds. Most proceeds are towards construction activities.

##### Risks

Does not include an investment to support transit vehicle priority. Lesser ability to leverage funds and maximize RTP outcomes as number of candidate projects is lesser.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorial Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Good	Good	No	Yes	Good

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
Categorial Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 6: Major Leverage Allocation

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$ -
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$10M
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$10M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$80M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 6 centers on allocating bond proceeds to those candidate projects which have identified large discretionary funding leveraging opportunities and proceeds would be applied as construction matching funds.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Burnside: Proposed allocation is for one vehicle priority element and all pedestrian elements.

Montgomery Park: Proposed allocation is for approximately half of estimated construction professional services costs towards matching funds contribution for CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Does not allocate the maximum amount of bond proceeds available. Represents investment in different transit investment types. High performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Proceeds are for construction activities only.

##### Risks

Partially maintains geographic distribution of bond proceeds. Assumes candidate project sponsor can secure additional matching funds to complete proposed scope of work. Possibility for some candidate projects to struggle to complete the scope proposed with partial funding. Trade off in performance and debt repayment if candidate projects cannot advance. High allocation of available bond proceeds and can present risks to Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorial Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Best	Best	Yes	Partial	Better

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
Categorial Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 7: FX Allocation

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$ -
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$ -
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$ -
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$60M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 7 centers on allocating a limited amount of bond proceeds to the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Projects only.

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Reflects a scenario heard from regional partners. Provides full bond proceeds funding requests to deliver upon project construction activities and position well for federal discretionary matching funds. Allocates well under the maximum amount of bond proceeds available, placing less risk and strain on Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B if revenue forecasts are not as expected. High performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Proceeds are for construction activities only. Easier process to administer bond.

##### Risks

Partially maintains geographic distribution of bond proceeds and does not represent investment in different transit investment types.\* Scenario 7 also reflects a bond allocation similar to those of preceding bond allocations and not reflective of diversifying regional transportation needs.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorial Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Best	Best	No*	Partial	Better

\*Scope of work for the two candidate projects include elements of transit vehicle priority and safe access to transit within the project scopes.

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
 Categorial Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial

### Attachment 3. Summary of Project Allocations, Scenario Performance, and Scenarios Profiles

#### Bond Scenario 8: Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Allocation

Requested Bond Proceeds	Candidate Project	Allocation Amount
\$30M	82nd Avenue Transit Project	\$30M
\$30M	Tualatin Valley Highway Transit Project	\$30M
\$15M	Sunrise Corridor Gateway Project	\$ -
\$25M	Burnside Bridge Transit Priority and Access Project	\$ -
\$20M	Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension	\$20M
<b>\$120M</b>	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$80M</b>

#### Scenario Description

Scenario 7 centers on allocating a limited amount of bond proceeds to the candidate projects eligible for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

#### Outline of Allocation Rationales

82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) application.

Tualatin Valley Highway: Proposed allocation is for full TriMet requested Metro contribution for construction phase matching funds towards the CIG application.

Montgomery Park: Proposed allocation is for full requested funds toward construction phase matching funds for CIG application.

#### Performance

##### Strengths

Reflects a scenario heard from regional partners. Provides full bond proceeds funding requests to deliver upon project construction activities and position well for federal discretionary matching funds. Allocates under the bond proceeds available. High performance for fund leveraging and maximizing RTP outcomes. Proceeds are for construction activities only. Easier process to administer bond.

##### Risks

Does not maintain geographic distribution of bond proceeds and does not represent investment in different transit investment types.\* Scenario 8 also reflects a bond allocation similar to those of preceding bond allocations and not reflective of diversifying regional transportation needs. May also be leaving different fund leveraging opportunities. High allocation of available bond proceeds and can present risks to Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 and Step 1B.

Theme	Maximized RTP Outcomes	Leverage	Categorical Representation	Geographic Distribution	Readiness
	Best	Best	No*	Partial	Better

\*Scope of work for the two candidate projects include elements of transit vehicle priority and safe access to transit within the project scopes.

Maximized RTP Outcomes, Leverage, Readiness Ratings: Good, Better, Best  
 Categorical Representation, Geographic Distribution Ratings: Yes, No, or Partial



# Memo

Date: Wednesday, November 27, 2024  
 To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee on Transportation and Interested Parties  
 From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner  
 Subject: 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 – Summary of Applications Received

**Purpose:** To provide a summary of applications received for the Step 2 allocation process.

**Background:**

The application period for the 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 allocation opened on Friday September 6<sup>th</sup> and closed on Friday November 22<sup>nd</sup> after an extension was granted due to a technical malfunction with the online application. In the lead up to the application period opening, a pre-application process took place where eligible jurisdictions submitted a letter of intent to apply with potential Step 2 applications. Through the letter of intent process, 11 jurisdictions received application assistance to support the development of one Step 2 application for submission.

**Step 2 Application Summary:**

Attachment 1 is a listing of the Step 2 applications for the Regional Flexible Fund allocation process. Attachment 2 is a map of the Step 2 project applications for consideration. In summary:

- Total Requested Regional Flexible Funds: \$139 million
- Total Estimate Cost of Potential Projects: \$198.6 million
- Number of Applications: 24
- Project Development Only Applications: 5

Table 1. breaks down a summary of the sub-regional of the Step 2 applications.

*Table 1. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund – Step 2 – Sub-Regional Summaries*

	<i>Washington County</i>	<i>East Multnomah County</i>	<i>Clackamas County</i>	<i>City of Portland</i>
Number of Applications	9	3	6	6
Project Development Only Applications	1	1	3	0
Requested Regional Flexible Funds	\$53M	\$14.4M	\$35.5M	\$36.2M
Total Estimate Cost of Candidate Projects	\$102M	\$16M	\$39.5M	\$40.9M

**Observations**

At a total of \$139M request in Regional Flexible Funds, this is between 2-3 times greater than the anticipated available funding (\$47-\$60M) in Step 2. The number of applications received is a little less than the previous cycles, but the requested funds is greater. A greater number of applications received for the 28-30 cycle focuses on project construction compared to the previous cycle.

A notable observation with the Step 2 applications for the 28-30 cycle is the steep increase in the overall costs of local projects, despite those projects largely remaining in similar in scope and scale as compared to previous cycle applications. Several reasons are attributed to the increased overall costs and funding requests from Regional Flexible Funds Step 2 allocation, including an increased overall cost threshold. But the notable reason is the recent period of rapid inflation, while cooling, has reset the price point for goods and services for delivering infrastructure projects.

**Attachment 1. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund - Step 2 - Applications Received**

<b>Nominating Agency</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>Requested Regional Flexible Funds</b>
Clackamas County	Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path	Design and construct new multimodal infrastructure to fill in gaps including new sidewalk segments, ADA ramps, and multi-use path. Network gaps will be filled along the northern side of SE Jennifer Street, from SE 106th Avenue to SE 122nd, a small gap along the western edge of SE 122nd Avenue, and a small gap on the southern side of SE Jennifer just west of 120th.	Clackamas	\$8,055,600	\$7,228,290
Gladstone	Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction	This project rebuilds the historic Trolley Trail Bridge to span the Clackamas River, connecting Gladstone to the north with Oregon City to the south.	Clackamas	\$9,720,196	\$8,721,932
Happy Valley	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)	Construct bike and pedestrian facilities on south side of OR 212 and construct second southbound vehicle turn lane at intersection of OR 212/224.	Clackamas	\$13,402,561	\$12,026,118
Lake Oswego	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd	Requested funds to design 3,500 feet long widening of Lakeview Boulevard for two 14-foot shared use lanes with an 8-foot sidewalk on one side separated by stormwater planter and curb.	Clackamas	\$1,095,500	\$983,000
Milwaukie	Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue	Develop buffered pedestrian/bicycle multiuse path adjacent to Railroad Avenue from 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue in Milwaukie, Oregon. Multiuse path will connect existing sidewalks at 37th Avenue, Linwood/Harmony Avenue, and intersecting side streets.	Clackamas	\$3,017,070	\$2,707,217
Oregon City	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to tumwata village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development	Complete a Type, Size, and Location (TS&L) analysis for the construction of an externally supported shared-use path and complete design for streetscape reconfiguration on McLoughlin Boulevard, which will include widened sidewalks, curb extensions, improved crossings, and new green spaces.	Clackamas	\$4,270,970	\$3,832,341
Gresham	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue	Construct new sidewalks and a cycle track on both sides of the street for pedestrians and bicyclists. Add center turn lane to create a 3-lane configuration and construct an enhanced mid-block crossing.	Multnomah	\$10,499,045	\$9,420,793
Gresham	NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsdales Avenue	Construct a sidewalk and a cycle track on both sides of the street to improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Multnomah	\$4,533,038	\$4,067,496
Multnomah County	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning	On NE 223rd Ave in Fairview and Wood Village, develop a corridor safety plan that inclusively engages the community in identifying priorities and evaluating design alternatives. Advance readiness for priority construction projects to fill complete street gaps and install safety countermeasures.	Multnomah	\$1,000,000	\$897,300
Portland	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)	The project will add ITS signal improvements along the project area. It will implement speed management timing, freight signal priority, and intelligent transportation system technology. With upgrades to signal interconnect communication and advanced transportation signal controllers, these signals will be ready for implementation of next generation transit signal priority timing.	Multnomah	\$4,922,544	\$4,416,999
Portland	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit	New enhanced crossings and signal modifications along NE MLK Jr Blvd (NE Hancock to NE Lombard St) at key locations. In addition to enhanced pedestrian crossings, the project will improve intersection lighting.	Multnomah	\$5,438,000	\$4,879,517
Portland	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access	This project will redesign Prescott Street to increase crossing access, signals, and bike lanes. It implements a priority project from the Building a Better 82nd Ave Plan and supports the future 82nd Avenue FX transit project.	Multnomah	\$8,618,000	\$7,732,932
Portland	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd	Construction of an off-street paved regional trail between SW Shattuck Rd and SW Fairvale Ct, including street crossing at SW Shattuck Rd and safe routes to Hayhurst Elementary School and Pendleton Park in Portland	Multnomah	\$9,176,962	\$7,677,446


**Attachment 1. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund - Step 2 - Applications Received**

Nominating Agency	Project Title	Description	County	Total Estimated Cost	Requested Regional Flexible Funds
Portland	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access	The project will reorganize travel lanes from 82nd Avenue to I-205, add new separated bicycle lanes from 80th Avenue to 102nd Avenue, improve bus priority approaching 82nd Avenue, and provide enhanced crossings at key intersections. The project includes enhanced crossings at 84th Avenue, 90th Avenue, and 92nd Avenue, and includes sidewalk widening from 92nd Avenue to I-205. The existing pedestrian and bike crossing at 87th Avenue will be further enhanced, and the signals at both entrances to I-205 will be modified.	Multnomah	\$8,445,000	\$7,577,698
Portland	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing	The project will add a signalized crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists (and serving future Green Loop) on W Burnside Street at Park Ave to connect the North and South Park Blocks, serve food cart pod, and provide access to the Darcelle XV Plaza. Additionally, the project adds a bus and bike lane eastbound from Park Ave to 3rd Ave connecting to the Burnside Bridge, including needed modification at 4th Ave signal to enable retention of protected left turn into Old Town / Chinatown.	Multnomah	\$4,389,000	\$3,938,250
Beaverton	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St	Design and construct complete street on SW Hall Blvd between 3rd Street and 5th Street with raised cycle track, shared bike/ped or island-style bus stop, new marked crosswalks and curb ramps, upgraded signals and street lighting, new inlets and vegetated stormwater management facilities, and pavement grind and inlay.	Washington	\$5,181,865	\$4,649,687
Hillsboro	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project	Construction of an AI-powered interconnected traffic signal and rail controller system implementing Transit Signal Priority and constructing a Better Bus slip lane on the SW 185th Avenue and W Baseline Road intersection.	Washington	\$5,272,738	\$4,572,738
King City	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City	The project will construct a new multi-use path along with new street connections, pedestrian crossings, and new roundabout between the Tualatin River and Beef Bend Road. The multi-use trail construction consists of approximately 4,100 linear feet of multi-use trail, adjacent soft-surface/equestrian trail. The street connections includes sidewalks, raised pedestrian crossings for the multi-use trail at SW Capulet Lane, SW Fisher Road, and SW River Lane. Extend and connect roadways between SW Cordelia Terrace and SW 137th Avenue, SW Montague Way and future River Lane. Lastly construct new roundabout at intersection of SW Fischer Road, SW 137th Avenue, and SW Watson. Extend roadway from roundabout to each existing road. Construct new alignment of SW 137th Ave and SW Watson to accommodate roundabout configuration. Install permanent landscaping, signage and striping, and roadway illumination system along/for street connections and utility relocations	Washington	\$9,568,610	\$7,841,343
Sherwood	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W	Design and construction of a regional trail between SW Pacific Highway, SW Edy Road, and SW Roy Rogers Road	Washington	\$9,960,030	\$8,860,030
Tigard	North Dakota Street (FannoCreek) Bridge Replacement	Replace bridge with bike lanes and sidewalk	Washington	\$26,336,556	\$8,000,000
Tualatin Hills PRD	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail	Construct a 12' wide multi-use trail bridge over US-26 eliminating out of direction bicycle and pedestrian routes.	Washington	\$30,334,019	\$6,000,000
Washington County	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements	Design and construct a multi-use trail on the south side of Merlo Road between Tualatin Nature Park and 170th Ave. to close a key gap in the Beaverton Creek Trail.	Washington	\$5,814,300	\$5,217,300
Washington County	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road	Project development for SW 175th Avenue will include data collection, environmental studies, preliminary engineering, and ROW identification to realign the roadway between SW Cooper Mountain Ln and SW Siler Ridge Ln.	Washington	\$2,890,000	\$2,593,196

**Attachment 1. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund - Step 2 - Applications Received**

Nominating Agency	Project Title	Description	County	Total Estimated Cost	Requested Regional Flexible Funds
Washington County	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements	The Cedar Mill Safe Access to Priority Transit Corridors project scope includes transit signal priority improvements, enhanced pedestrian crossings, and lane reconfigurations along Cornell and Barnes roads within the Cedar Mill Town Center.	Washington	\$6,690,000	\$5,252,300
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$198,631,604</b>	<b>\$139,093,923</b>

# Regional Flexible Funds Allocation 2028-30: Step 2 Application Map



Map Label	Project Name	Project Sponsor/ Nominating Agency	Sub-Regional Location	Requested Regional Flexible Funds	Total Project Cost Estimate
1	Clackamas Industrial Area Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path	Clackamas County	Clackamas	\$7,228,290.00	\$8,055,600.00
2	Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge Construction	Gladstone	Clackamas	\$8,721,932.00	\$9,720,196.00
3	OR 212/224 Sunrise Hwy Phase 2: Bike/Ped Facilities and Interchange Improvements (CON)	Happy Valley	Clackamas	\$12,026,120.00	\$13,402,560.00
4	Lakeview Blvd - Jean Rd to McEwan Rd	Lake Oswego	Clackamas	\$983,000.00	\$1,095,500.00
5	Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue	Milwaukie	Clackamas	\$2,707,217.00	\$3,017,070.00
6	OR99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10th Street to Tumwater Village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development	Oregon City	Clackamas	\$3,832,341.00	\$4,270,970.00
7	NE Halsey Street Complete Street: 192nd Avenue - 201st Avenue	Gresham	Multnomah	\$9,420,793.00	\$10,499,050.00
8	NW Division Street Complete Street: Gresham-Fairview Trail - Birdsedale Avenue	Gresham	Multnomah	\$4,067,496.00	\$4,533,038.00
9	NE 223rd Ave: NE Glisan to NE Marine Dr Safety Corridor Planning	Multnomah County	Multnomah	\$897,300.00	\$1,000,000.00
10	Outer Halsey and Outer Foster (ITS Signal Improvements)	Portland BOT	Multnomah	\$4,416,999.00	\$4,922,544.00
11	NE MLK Jr Blvd Safety and Access to Transit	Portland BOT	Multnomah	\$4,879,517.00	\$5,438,000.00
12	NE Glisan St: 82nd Avenue Multimodal Safety and Access	Portland BOT	Multnomah	\$7,732,932.00	\$8,618,000.00
13	W Burnside Green Loop Crossing	Portland BOT	Multnomah	\$7,677,446.00	\$9,176,962.00
14	NE Prescott St: 82nd Ave Multimodal Safety and Access	Portland BOT	Multnomah	\$7,577,698.00	\$8,445,000.00
15	Red Electric Trail East of SW Shattuck Rd	Portland Parks	Multnomah	\$3,938,250.00	\$4,389,000.00
16	Beaverton Downtown Loop: SW Hall Blvd – 3rd St to 5th St	Beaverton	Washington	\$4,649,687.00	\$5,181,865.00
17	Smart SW 185th Avenue ITS and Better Bus Project	Hillsboro	Washington	\$4,572,738.00	\$5,272,738.00
18	Westside Trail Segment 1 - King City	King City	Washington	\$7,841,343.00	\$9,568,610.00
19	Cedar Creek/Ice Age Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W	Sherwood	Washington	\$8,860,030.00	\$9,960,030.00
20	North Dakota Street (Fanno Creek) Bridge Replacement	Tigard	Washington	\$8,000,000.00	\$26,336,560.00
21	Bridge Crossing of Hwy. 26 by the Westside Trail	Tualatin Hills PRD	Washington	\$6,000,000.00	\$30,334,020.00
22	Beaverton Creek Trail: Merlo Road Improvements	Washington County	Washington	\$5,217,300.00	\$5,814,300.00
23	SW 175th Design: SW Condor Lane to SW Kemmer Road	Washington County	Washington	\$2,593,196.00	\$2,890,000.00
24	Cedar Mill Better Bus and Access to Transit Enhancements	Washington County	Washington	\$5,252,300.00	\$6,690,000.00



# Memo

Date: Wednesday, November 27, 2024  
To: Transportation Policy Alternatives Committee (TPAC) and Interested Parties  
From: Grace Cho, Principal Transportation Planner  
Subject: 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Allocation (RFFA) – Step 2 Next Steps - Updated

---

## **Purpose**

To provide TPAC an overview of the next steps for the Step 2 allocation process, following the November 22, 2024 closing deadline for the Call for Projects.

## **Background & Process Context**

The 2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 allocation is underway with regional partners currently developing applications to submit for consideration in the Step 2 allocation process. Due to a technical malfunction with the online application tool during the final week of the Call for Projects, Metro extended the deadline for applications submissions to Friday November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2024.

Following the closure of the Call for Projects, the Step 2 process will transition into the application evaluation phase. But due to the extension, the Step 2 schedule has shifted in various ways which has implications for Step 2 applicants. The remainder of this memorandum is to outline the updated Step 2 schedule and next steps in the Step 2 evaluation process as a result of the extended application submission deadline.

## **Step 2 Allocation – Evaluation Phase & Modified Process Changes**

The 2028-2030 RFFA Step 2 evaluation phase includes two components: 1) an outcomes evaluation assessing the application performance towards advancing regional policy objectives; and 2) a risk assessment evaluating the challenges the project is likely to encounter with the federal aid project delivery process. The outcomes evaluation and project delivery risk assessment processes will occur concurrently through late November 2024 through early March 2025, a month later than outlined in initial schedules. At the March 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, TPAC will receive a first look at the outcomes evaluation and project delivery risk assessment results with the opportunity to comment. After receiving comment and feedback from the first look, Metro staff will finalize results of the outcomes evaluation and project delivery risk assessment are to be available in late March 2025 near the time frame of the public comment period opening. Going from the first look draft of the Step 2 evaluation results to the finalized results will be under a compressed timeline as a result of application deadline extension.

The schedule outlined in Table 1 reflects the updated evaluation process schedule. A short description of the updated project delivery risk assessment evaluation processes is provided below as the updated schedule has implications for the Step 2 project delivery risk assessment refinement opportunities.

### *Project Delivery Risk Assessment*

To ensure Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 projects can be delivered as proposed, on time, within budget, and make it through the federal aid process, Metro will conduct a project delivery risk assessment on each candidate and issue a report documenting the findings. Candidates will be evaluated on how completely the project has been planned, developed and scoped, and measure the risk of project fund obligation within the 2028 through 2030 timeframe. The Project Delivery Risk Assessment results are presented with a rating of risk level by individual project. Recommendations from the Project Delivery Risk Assessment will inform conditions of approval

and/or required early project development activities if the candidate project is awarded Regional Flexible Funds.

In previous Step 2 processes, applicants received an opportunity to clarify or revise parts of applications according to the draft results of the Project Delivery Risk Assessment near the end of the evaluation process. This refinement period usually extended the timeframe from which the initial results could be finalized and prepared for sharing with coordinating committees and as part of the public comment. With the compressed schedule, a refinement period after the first look of the full results is less feasible. In efforts to support applicants in identifying and addressing risks prior to issuing final findings, Metro staff have moved up the process to January 2025 for applicants to provide clarity and, if electing, modify their Step 2 applications to address identified risks. Over the course of December 2024, the consultant teams conducting the Step 2 project delivery risk assessment will compile initial comments and questions on their individual applications to share with applicants by Friday January 3, 2025. From January 3 – January 17, 2025, applicants have a 2-week window to respond to clarifying questions or revise aspects of the applications for the purposes of the risk assessment. Responses to questions will need to be reflected as part of application narratives or uploaded as an attachment through the online application tool, which will be reopened for the 2-week window for applicants to access. Following the refinement window, the project delivery risk assessment will take place utilizing the updated information received on the Step 2 applications. The Project Delivery Assessment draft results will be issued for the March 7, 2025 TPAC meeting, before the issuing the final project delivery risk assessment results in a report in late March 2025.

**Table 2. 28-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 – Updated Schedule**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Step 2 Call for Projects Closes	November 22, 2024
Step 2 – Summary of Received Applications (TPAC and JPACT)	December 2 & 18, 2024
Step 2 evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outcomes Evaluation</li> <li>Project delivery risk assessment</li> </ul>	November 2024 – February 2025
Step 2 Project Delivery Risk Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initial review by Kittelson on all applications</li> </ul>	December 2 – December 20, 2024
Step 2 Project Delivery Risk Assessment – refinement and clarification period opens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicants to receive communication of initial risk assessment results and clarification questions</li> <li>Reopen Project Tracker for applications edits at 9 a.m.</li> </ul>	January 3, 2025
Step 2 Project Delivery Risk Assessment – refinement period closes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Tracker closes for application edits at 4 p.m.</li> </ul>	January 17, 2025
Step 2 Evaluation Results (TPAC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes outcomes evaluation and project delivery risk assessment</li> <li>Comments for finalizing</li> </ul>	March 7, 2025
Step 2 Evaluation Results – finalized results	Late March 2025
Step 2 evaluation results made available for county coordinating committee discussions	March 2025
2028-2030 RFFA public comment opens	March 24, 2025
2028-2030 RFFA public hearing/testimony	April 17, 2025*
2028-2030 RFFA public comment closes	April 28, 2025

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Date</b>
Initial summary of 2028-2030 RFFA public comments with responses and draft/tentative staff recommendations for refinements to TPAC	May 2, 2025*
Summary of 2028-2030 RFFA public comments with responses and staff recommendations for refinements to JPACT (Public Comment Report)	May 15, 2025*
Coordinating committee priorities submitted (if electing to submit priorities)	May 2025
TPAC and JPACT opportunity to deliberate input received on Step 2 candidate projects	June 2025
TPAC and JPACT action on 2028-2030 RFFA	July 2025



# Clackamas Industrial Area Multimodal Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path

Metro RTP Project #11772 | Clackamas County TSP Projects #1015 and #3015

## Area and context


Located next to the major transportation routes of I-205, Hwy 212, and Hwy 224 in Clackamas County, the Clackamas Industrial Area has leveraged its strategic location into one of the busiest freight distribution centers in the region and state. This regional distribution, warehousing and wholesale trade center district was created in 1984 to support development of the area as a vital employment center and has transformed into an attractive commercial and residential service center that now boasts more than 7,500 jobs within 1,187 acres. Within this area, SE Jennifer Street is an east-west Minor Arterial that connects people to destinations of all types.

## Project description

Design and construct sidewalks, ADA ramps, and multi-use paths to fill gaps along the northern side of Jennifer St between 106<sup>th</sup> Ave and 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave, a small gap along the western edge of 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave, and a small gap on the southern side of Jennifer St just west of 120<sup>th</sup> Ave. These proposed elements will improve access to jobs, transit bus routes and shuttles, shopping, eateries, and transitional housing communities in the Clackamas Industrial Area.

The proposed design treatments are context sensitive and respond to specific constraints along the corridor. Proposed treatments in each segment support Clackamas County design standards informed by recent best practices.

Total cost	Local match	RFFA 2028-2030 funding request
\$ 8,055,600	\$ 827,310	\$ 7,228,290



SE Jennifer St project location, major scope elements, and proposed design segments.

# Clackamas Industrial Area Multimodal Improvements: SE Jennifer Street Multi-use Path

## Existing conditions and challenges

Intermittent sidewalks and bike lanes on Jennifer Street force people walking, rolling, and biking to travel along narrow or nonexistent shoulders, creating unsafe conditions for all travelers.


Two communities of concern reside in the area with specific transportation needs. These vulnerable populations rely on institutional supports to receive critical services. Reducing barriers in the built environment can have significant impact on the health and quality of life of our communities of concern and would be beneficial for all people who walk and bike to jobs in the immediate area, or for recreational use.




*Existing conditions photos highlight gaps in the sidewalk and biking network, and non-compliant ADA curb ramps.*

## Proposed design treatments

The existing conditions vary along the corridor and include many gaps in the active transportation network. Portions of the proposed improvements shown below include a shared multi-use path with a landscaping buffer, pedestrian-scale lighting and new sidewalks and bike lanes.



*Existing conditions between 106<sup>th</sup> Ave and 115<sup>th</sup> Ave at left, and proposed improvements at right.*



*Existing conditions immediately west of 120<sup>th</sup> Ave above, and proposed improvements below.*

## Connecting vulnerable residents to critical services

In the middle of the proposed project area near SE 115<sup>th</sup> Street, two important communities will benefit from the proposed multimodal improvements.

Since 2018, the Veterans Village has served as a transitional shelter and community space for up to 24 veterans at a time. Each person has a pod to sleep and store personal items. Residents access a shared kitchen, bathroom, showers, meeting spaces and other services onsite.

In 2025, the Clackamas Village will build on the Veterans Village transitional housing success and will provide even more supportive services for houseless adults including health care, housing and employment assistance, peer support, mental health and recovery services, counseling, life skills training, financial education, and more.



Residents of both communities will benefit from these proposed multimodal improvements, enhancing safe travel options to nearby destinations, transit services, and employment sites.

## 2028-2030 RFFA Project Descriptions



### Amount Requested

- \$8,722,000

### Match Requirement

- \$998,196

### Total Project Cost

- \$9,720,196

### Project Contact

Marci Jory

Economic Development and  
Tourism Coordinator

[jory@ci.gladstone.or.us](mailto:jory@ci.gladstone.or.us)

**Project Name:** Gladstone Historic Trolley Trail Bridge

**Applicant:** City of Gladstone

### Project Purpose and Need:

The Trolley Trail is part of greater Portland's trail system for people walking, bicycling and rolling. The historic Trolley Trail Bridge across the Clackamas River was destroyed in a 2014 flood; its reconstruction will provide the "missing link" in the Trolley Trail. The new bridge connection will enhance the role of McLoughlin Blvd to serve as a major regional transportation, transit, and freight corridor by creating a safe and convenient alternative connection for active transportation modes, reducing modal conflicts on McLoughlin Blvd. The project is aligned with the region's goals of equitable transportation, safe systems, climate action and resilience, mobility options, and thriving economy.

- **Equitable transportation:** The bridge would reduce dependence on automobile trips and provide convenient alternative modes of travel between Gladstone and Oregon City. The bridge would make access to jobs in northern Oregon City, including the Oregon City Shopping Center, more available to residents of Gladstone.
- **Safe Systems:** The nearest parallel route, McLoughlin Blvd, is identified as one of 25 high-injury corridors in the region according to Metro. This project would divert active modes of transportation onto a safe and convenient alternative route.
- **Climate Action and Resilience:** By providing a safe and efficient non-motorized route across Clackamas River, the project will reduce reliance on vehicles and will lead to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The new bridge will be resilient against high flood events and earthquake events, providing resilience to the region.
- **Mobility Options:** The project expands multimodal options by providing a dedicated pedestrian and bicycle path for residents and commuters. The project will also be designed to current ADA standards, providing accessibility for users with vision and mobility impairments.
- **Thriving Economy:** The bridge will provide a safe and efficient non-motorized route across the Clackamas River, enhancing regional connectivity. Improved connectivity can attract and retain a talented workforce, benefiting local businesses and the overall economy. Additionally, providing an alternative non-motorized route, the bridge will reduce transportation costs for businesses and residents, boosting economic activity.


### Proposed Design:

The proposed design consists of a 12-foot wide trail that connects the communities of Gladstone and Oregon City. The project crosses Clackamas River with a 365-foot span bridge crossing that has 16-foot wide walking/biking surface. The project starts at the intersection of Portland Avenue and Clackamas Boulevard on the north end of the project and connects to the Clackamas River Greenway Trail on the south end of the project. A feasibility study was previously completed and several bridge type alternatives were investigated. The City of Gladstone is pursuing funding for the preferred alternative, a single span steel truss bridge that imitates the character of the original railroad trolley bridge.

### Funding:

The City recognizes the high construction cost estimate for the project and remains committed to delivering this project within the RTP project scope. The City is open to exploring other funding sources and other bridge alternatives in order to successfully deliver this crucial project to the community. Evaluations are currently underway through February 2025. RFFA priority identification will occur March to May 2025, and recommendations for project funding are expected June to July 2025.

## Project Vicinity Map



## Project Concept Visualization (for visualization purposes only)



# RECONFIGURING Rock Creek Junction



## PROJECT NEED

Happy Valley, Estacada, Sandy, and the unincorporated communities of east Clackamas County rely on Rock Creek Junction to access industrial lands within the Metro Urban Growth Boundary. However, increased housing production in East Clackamas County has caused significant traffic congestion, frequent accidents, and transit delays. As a result, the extended area has become a high-traffic, high-injury corridor.

To address these issues, the proposed Rock Creek Junction reconfiguration project will:

- ✓ Add a second eastbound right turn lane at the intersection and a corresponding southbound receiving lane
- ✓ Extend southbound receiving lanes 1,000 feet past the intersection, merging into a single lane
- ✓ Upgrade substandard bike and pedestrian facilities along the route
- ✓ Fill regional network gaps, providing safer non-motorized travel options

## THE BOTTOM LINE


This project is essential to enhancing safety, improving transit reliability, and supporting further housing development in the region.


## MAKING ROOM

Over the next 20 years, the Rock Creek Junction area is poised to experience substantial growth. As the region continues to develop, it is expected to attract numerous new jobs and an expanding population.

Unfortunately, OR 212 and OR 224 are not capable of handling the expected traffic increase predicted to occur. Infrastructure improvements are desperately needed to accommodate this projected influx.

## FAST FACTS





## SOMETHING TO CONSIDER

In just two decades, the Rock Creek Junction area is projected to add around 14,000 new jobs and 43,000 more residents. The current OR 212 and OR 224 corridors cannot handle this anticipated traffic increase. Since 2013, over 157 crashes have occurred here, highlighting the urgent need for upgrades.

The area has significant economic potential, but growth will be hampered if travel remains unsafe and inefficient. Addressing these infrastructure needs is essential for ensuring a functioning future for this stretch of roadway.

Additionally, enhancing non-motorized travel options will provide safer routes for bicyclists and pedestrians, promoting healthier and more sustainable commuting practices. This will not only improve individual safety but also support local businesses by making the area more accessible to employees and customers.

## SECURE A SAFER, MORE PROSPEROUS FUTURE

The reconfiguration project at Rock Creek Junction is critical for enhancing safety, improving transit reliability, and fostering economic growth. These improvements will lay the foundation for a thriving, prosperous community for years to come.

## 2028-2030 RFFA Project Descriptions

Project Name: Lakeview Boulevard Improvements

Applicant: City of Lake Oswego

Amount requested: \$112,500

Total project cost: \$983,000

Project purpose and need:

Lakeview Boulevard between Jean Road and McEwan Road separates one of the City's major employment areas and a residential neighborhood. Currently, the street contributes to barriers for both the businesses in the district and the local neighborhood with its limited pedestrian infrastructure, poor employment access, and little-to-no stormwater facilities. The safety of pedestrians, congestion at adjacent intersections, and the presence of large trucks using local neighborhood streets are common concerns raised by both neighbors and businesses in this area.

The City would like to pursue funding to assist with project planning, community outreach, and the development of 30% engineering design plans to advance the project to a position it can be further considered for construction funding. Based on prior planning efforts, the City believes that Lakeview Boulevard can be reconstructed to not only provide better access to businesses to improve the activity and diversity of the district, but also to provide a safer and more comfortable pedestrian facility to increase mobility options for both employees and nearby residents.

Proposed design:

The City's Transportation System Plan, the Southwest Employment Area Plan, and Metro's 2018 Regional Transportation Plan all describe reconstructing Lakeview Boulevard to include two 14-foot travel lanes (to be shared between vehicles and bicyclists), a separated pedestrian facility, and facilities to treat stormwater. Based on the Southwest Employment Area Plan, the area dedicated to sidewalks, landscaping, and stormwater facilities would vary depending on the available right-of-way; however, it is expected that residents on the south/east side and the businesses on the north/west side of Lakeview would receive a landscaped area and the north/west side of Lakeview would receive stormwater facilities and a sidewalk.

Since the Southwest Employment Area Plan was completed back in 2016, the City would like to conduct further planning efforts and community outreach to begin the design of a facility that will serve the needs of businesses and residents while increasing the livability of the streets in the area.



# Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path: 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue



CITY OF MILWAUKIE

## Project purpose and need

Railroad Avenue is an efficient east-west route from commercial and industrial areas in Clackamas County to downtown Milwaukie, Milwaukie Marketplace, and the Ardenwald-Johnson Creek, Hector Campbell, and Linwood neighborhoods. Railroad Avenue is designed for the movement of motor vehicles, and lacks connected sidewalks and bike paths along the corridor. A multiuse path will improve physical and psychological safety along the corridor for those walking, rolling, and cycling by providing a designated area for all users of all abilities.

By improving the safety and connectivity of the route, the Railroad Avenue project will improve active transportation and reduce travel times in this area. On the east end of the project corridor, the multiuse path will connect to multi-modal facilities on Linwood Avenue, multi-modal access to Clackamas Community College and Clackamas Town Center, and to industrial areas on Harmony Road. On the west end, the multiuse path will connect to sidewalks on 37th Avenue, leading to the Monroe Street Greenway and Milwaukie Marketplace. Through the project corridor the multiuse path will connect to existing sidewalks along the route, on Home Avenue, and to the Stanley Greenway. Project corridor intersections will be assessed and improved for safety and ADA accessibility.

The Railroad Avenue multiuse path will decrease drive alone vehicle trips, reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Planted street trees and shrubs will reduce heat island effects, and improved stormwater management facilities will increase climate resiliency and surface water quality.

The Railroad Avenue multiuse path is a priority 1 Milwaukie SAFE project. Railroad Avenue borders the Cascade Heights Public Charter School, is in the walkshed of six additional K-12 schools, and the enrollment area of ten K-12 schools. The multiuse path will improve safe multi-modal access to existing transit, currently more than 0.25 mile from portions of the project area, and pave the way for a future bus route.

## Proposed design

The Railroad Avenue project will construct a 12-foot multiuse path along the north side of Railroad Avenue from 37th Avenue to Linwood Avenue. The project will connect to sidewalks one block south of the Monroe Greenway on the west end, tie into sidewalks on Home Avenue and the Stanley Greenway, and connect to multiuse paths on Linwood Avenue on the east end.

The multiuse path will be separated from Railroad Avenue by a 5.5-foot planter strip, providing shade and protection to users. The existing open stormwater ditches will be replaced with updated stormwater management infrastructure, and retaining walls will be installed to accommodate steep slopes along the project corridor.

Conceptual Project Construction Cost:  
**\$8,866,375**

Total Project Cost for Engineering Support:  
**\$3,017,070**


Requested RFFA Funds:  
**\$2,707,217**

Local Match:  
**\$309,853**

## Project Map



Evaluate intersections for safety




Connect to existing sidewalks/paths



Lower level of stress for all users

## Cross-Section: Railroad Avenue Multiuse Path





## OR 99E (McLoughlin Boulevard) 10<sup>th</sup> Street to tumwata village: Shared-Use Path and Streetscape Enhancements Project Development

Amount requested: \$3,927,917.29

Total project cost: \$4,377,485

### Project purpose and need:


Connecting downtown Oregon City to the waterfront for people walking and biking is a dream that has been several decades in the making. Two segments of a waterfront path have already been built, connecting downtown Oregon City with the pathway along the Clackamas River. The last critical gap is McLoughlin Boulevard (OR99E) between 10th Street and Railroad Avenue.

The proposed project will deliver streetscape enhancements along McLoughlin Boulevard to invite more activity along the waterfront, encourage travel to downtown Oregon City and construct a new shared-use path that would fill a critical active transportation gap. This shared-use path is intended to contribute to the sense of place and community identity while providing recreational access and closing a critical gap in the region's active transportation network for people walking, biking, and rolling. It will allow people to visit the future Willamette Falls Riverwalk and tumwata village without having to mix with traffic. Within the project area, the following transportation needs have been identified by the project team to guide the development of an active transportation solution:

- **There is a gap in safe, comfortable, and accessible facilities for people of all ages and abilities who are walking and biking on McLoughlin Boulevard.** The cross-section along McLoughlin Boulevard between 10th Street and the proposed tumwata village and riverwalk consists of curb-tight sidewalks and four vehicle lanes. This cross-section does not meet the current ODOT Highway Design Manual or City of Oregon City design standards and creates an imbalance between how the needs of non-motorized and motorized users are being addressed in the corridor.
- **Oregon City's waterfront is currently disjointed and not seen as a contiguous amenity.** Locally, active transportation facilities along McLoughlin Boulevard are needed to provide connections to the planned tumwata village and riverwalk, historic downtown Oregon City, envisioned pedestrian and bicycle bridge, and recreation opportunities along the Willamette River. This active transportation connection will create additional opportunities for people to access, experience, and visually imagine the historic significance of the river, Willamette Falls, and adjacent lands, while honoring the indigenous connections to the land and acknowledging traditional ways of movement along waterways.
- **The chosen design will support Oregon City's tourism, economic, and community development goals by improving walking and biking facilities to better integrate and reorient the downtown area's relationship with the Willamette River.** Active transportation facilities are shown to improve economic conditions by creating attractive and walkable business districts and providing access to various destinations, local businesses, and jobs. Vehicle congestion and parking limitations discourage travel in downtown Oregon City and are therefore a barrier to businesses and expanded

economic development. A complete connection for people walking, biking, and rolling along McLoughlin Boulevard and to historic downtown Oregon City, Oregon City Transit Center, and the municipal elevator is needed to encourage mode shift support transportation demand management efforts, minimize impacts to adjacent residential areas, and support the Oregon City 2040 Comprehensive Plan policies related to multimodal connectivity and transportation demand management.


- **Vehicular congestion impacts the historical, cultural, and environmental aspects of the site.** Vehicular congestion creates noise and emissions that detract from the historic, cultural, and environmental aspects of the site. A continuous shared-use path connection is needed to create an opportunity for transportation mode shifts consistent with the region’s climate goals, and ensure that historical, cultural, and environmental resources are preserved for future generations.



**Proposed Design:**

The proposed project will complete a Type, Size, & Location report to refine the design of the proposed shared-use path on McLoughlin Boulevard between 10<sup>th</sup> Street and tumwata village. The preferred alternative for this shared-use path is an external long-span cable-supported structure connecting to McLoughlin Boulevard at 10<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and Water Streets. In addition, the proposed project will complete project development activities through the Design Acceptance Package (DAP) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental process for streetscape reconfiguration on McLoughlin Boulevard between 10<sup>th</sup> Street and Railroad Avenue. The Streetscape Enhancements will:

- Reconstruct a sidewalk on the south side of the roadway that meets Highway Design Manual guidance for sidewalk, frontage, and buffer zone widths for improved pedestrian comfort.
- Rehabilitate and upgrade existing deficient pedestrian crossings at Main, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> Streets with reflective backplates, high visibility crosswalks, and pedestrian friendly signal timing strategies.
- Construct curb extensions at Main Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Street, 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and 9<sup>th</sup> Street.
- Reconstruct driveway accesses at the McLoughlin Boulevard ‘elbow’.
- Explore opportunities to create new green, open spaces between 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Streets and at the McLoughlin Boulevard elbow.



*Proposed Cross-Section: 6th Street to 8th Street (Option A)*

## Memorandum

**To:** C4 Metro Subcommittee  
**From:** **Team TPAC, Representing Clackamas County & Clackamas Cities**  
**Re:** February 7, 2025 TPAC Highlights  
**Date:** February 10, 2025

---

### Overview

Following is a summary of the January TPAC Meeting and a look ahead into future meetings. February meeting materials can be found [here](#).

### General Updates

- **Fatal Crash Update:** According to recent data available, Metro shared that there were approximately six traffic deaths in January across Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington counties. Of this total, three people died while walking, four while operating a motor vehicle and one as a pedestrian. Three fatalities occurred in Clackamas County. Metro continues their commitment to a safe systems approach, advocating for safe streets, speeds, and people. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is investing nearly \$6 million in Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS), with projects filling sidewalks and adding safe crossings in Gresham, Forest Grove, Portland, and Clackamas and Washington Counties. See a list of SRTS projects [here](#). The Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) is installing reflective metal roadside delineators along NE Marine Drive, a high injury corridor. The project is part of City of Portland's Vision Zero effort to eliminate traffic deaths and serious injuries. Learn more about PBOT's Vision Zero efforts [here](#).
- **Transit Minute:** Metro reported that in 2024, the region achieved over 75 million rides – a 9% increase over 2023 and a 34% increase compared to 2021. Over the past year, transit investment in new services, route adjustments, schedule enhancements, and increased frequency has been increased. Transit priority projects, including new signal technology, queue jumps, and bus-only lanes, as well as the Better Bus program have also contributed to the region's investment in transit priority. While annual transit trips rose, December 2024 was flat compared to December 2023.
- **Committee Updates from around the Region:**
  - Clackamas County: The County recently held a kickoff meeting for its Consolidated Safe System Planning, a groundbreaking initiative to transform road safety in Clackamas County, emphasizing collaboration among county divisions and Metro representatives, in effort to enhance regional safety strategies.
  - Oregon Department of Transportation: ODOT congratulated the recipients of the latest round of Safe Routes to School projects and shared a [list](#) of the Recommended Projects for the 2025-2026 Competitive Construction Program. Additionally, pre-construction activities are underway for the Outer Powell Transportation Safety Project; more information about the project is listed [here](#). Lastly, ODOT is recruiting a Senior Transportation Planner for their Delivery & Operations Division in Region 1. The recruitment posting can be found [here](#).
- **Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Update:** Metro announced that the draft 2025-26 UPWP is available for review and will be discussed in the March TPAC meeting. TPAC members are encouraged to review the document and submit comments.
- **Public Comments:** Chris Smith of the No More Freeways Campaign provided testimony on the Rose Quarter Project and MTIP amendment, raising concerns about the project's phasing and financial risks.

- Minutes Approved: The January 10<sup>th</sup> TPAC minutes were approved with no changes.
- FFY 2025 Redistribution Funding (Resolution 24-5464): TPAC endorsed \$10 million in redistribution funds to nine projects, ensuring obligation of funds before the May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, deadline for FFY 2025 projects. This redistribution benefits two projects within Clackamas County: Courtney Ave Complete Street: River Road - OR99E, and City of Milwaukie: Washington/Monroe Street: SE 37th - SE Linwood Ave.
- MTIP Amendments Summary: TPAC recommended JPACT approval of MTIP Resolution 25-5465 for the purpose of amending or adding a total of four projects to meet federal transportation project delivery requirements. Of these four, 3 are adding new planning projects, and 1 is a project cancelation. The following summarizes each:
  - New Metro Planning Projects:
    - Reconnecting 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Community Planning Study (Key TBD New Project) – a study to develop and deliver equitable outcomes through zero-emission, bus-rapid transit that connects disadvantaged communities to jobs, education, economic opportunity, public space, and parks.
    - TV Highway Community Connections Planning Study (Key TBD New Project) – a study on TV Hwy/OR8 to develop equitable outcomes through zero-emission, bus-rapid transit that connects disadvantaged communities to jobs, education, economic opportunity, public space, and parks.
  - New Metro Regional Rail Planning Study:
    - Regional Rail Futures Study (Key 23834) – SB 5701 funded study to evaluate the use of existing heavy freight rail assets in the Portland Metropolitan area for passenger rail alternatives to augment existing transportation modes.
  - Cancel ODOT US30BY Rail Crossings Hazards Mitigation Project:
    - US30B: (NE Lombard St) NE Lombard PI – NE 11<sup>th</sup> (Key 23090) – design and right-of-way to improve the rail crossing on NE 11<sup>th</sup> Ave and close the crossing at NE Lombard Place while retaining business access. Install new railroad signals and gates to improve the signalized intersection at NE Lombard St and 11<sup>th</sup> Ave. Construct sidewalk infill west from NE 11<sup>th</sup> Ave to existing sidewalk. This project aims to improve safety at this location. The refined project cost made the project no longer feasible at this time.

## **2028-2030 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 – Finalized Bond Scenarios and Results**

### Approach to Developing Bond Scenarios

Metro considered four key factors in developing bond scenarios: (1) balancing performance across five regional themes (maximized RTP outcomes, leverage, categorical investment representation, investment across the region, project readiness), (2) consideration of regional partner input to ensure certain projects met higher performance thresholds, (3) maintaining consistency with the bond’s purpose and principles established in the RFFA Program direction, and (4) applying financial constraints (\$84 million maximum), as the total funding requests exceeded the available bond capacity. To align with these factors, Metro narrowed down the number of candidate projects from nine to five. The four eliminated projects were:

- SW 185<sup>th</sup> Avenue MAX Overcrossing
- Better Bus Program
- OR 99E McLoughlin Boulevard Safe Access to Transit Enhancements
- 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Tigard Triangle Corridor Improvements (Phase 1)

Metro acknowledged that these projects were strong candidates but were not prioritized due to financial constraints.

Metro also noted that the finalized bond scenario assumes a single bond mechanism, allowing for a maximum of \$84 million in bond proceeds. This means that a multiple bond mechanism has been ruled out, as it was deemed cost-prohibitive. Metro added that a single bond mechanism can still allow multiple project types to advance and would likely involve a fund swap to accommodate multiple project types. Another important factor in this process was the impact of bonding on Step 2 of the RFFA Program, which is responsible for repaying the bond debt. The estimated Step 2 allocation for this cycle is \$42-\$45 million for local transportation projects, with debt payments continuing until 2039. If the new bond does move forward, it could reduce the total funding available for Step 2 in future funding cycles.

#### Overview of Bond Scenarios and Candidate Projects

Metro presented eight bond scenario options for TPAC members to review. The scenarios were grouped into thematic categories:

- Scenarios 1–4 prioritized regional and corridor-scale investments based on balancing the five key bond performance themes
- Scenario 5 focused on geographic distribution of funding
- Scenario 6 prioritized projects with strong funding leverage potential
- Scenarios 7 – 8 allocated funds exclusively to transit capital investments.

Metro emphasized that because funding requests exceed available resources, allocations will ultimately have to be adjusted based on project feasibility and prioritization, alignment with regional transportation goals, and impact on other funding resources. As of now, Metro staff determined the potential funding adjustments internally without yet confirming with nominating agencies; this means that agencies may need to further adjust their scopes based on available funding and work with Metro to refine and update critical funding thresholds. The following summarizes the remaining five candidate projects with their respective funding allocations:

#### **82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit Project**

Requested: \$30 million (for local match contribution to a federal grant)

Allocation across scenarios: \$25-30 million

Rationale: a reduced allocation would require the project to seek additional matching funds from other sources

#### **Tualatin Valley (TV) Highway Transit Project**

Requested: \$30 million (for local match contribution to a federal grant)

Allocation across scenarios: \$25-30 million

Rationale: similar to 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue project, any reduction in funds would require alternative funding sources

#### **Sunrise Gateway Corridor Project**

Requested: \$15 million (for NEPA re-evaluation and design of active transportation & transit enhancements)

Allocation across scenarios: \$6.5-15 million, unfunded in scenarios 6, 7 & 8

Rationale: lower allocations prioritize project design deliverables rather than full NEPA re-evaluation. Metro sought to focus funding on construction-oriented activities

#### **Burnside Bridge Transit Priority & Pedestrian Access Project**

Requested: \$25 million (for transit vehicle priority measures and pedestrian access improvements)

Allocation across scenarios: \$5-10 million, unfunded in scenarios 5, 7 & 8

Rationale: funding would support new bus tops, queue jumps, and improved access to transit during bridge construction. The reduced allocation was determined based on specific scope elements that could be fully funded at a lower amount.

### **Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension Project**

Requested: \$20 million

Allocation across scenarios: \$7.5-20 million, unfunded in scenarios 5 & 7

Rationale: reductions followed a similar logic to the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and TV Highway projects, requiring the project to seek additional matching funds elsewhere; the reduced allocation focused on funding right-of-way acquisition and construction services, as outlined in the cost estimates.

### Discussion & TPAC Member Feedback on Bond Scenarios

There was a strong interest in moving forward with the bond issuance at the full \$84 million level, though differing opinions on specific allocations were discussed among committee members. The following feedback on funding allocation, priorities, and overall strategy for bond issuance centered on the following themes:

- **Support for a Comprehensive Approach, Project Selection and Geographic Balance**: several TPAC members voiced support for scenarios that allocate funding to a diverse range of projects, rather than concentrating funds solely on CIG projects. The importance of first-mile/last-mile transit improvements to enhance accessibility and connectivity should be prioritized in alignment with strong public support. Additionally, ensuring that all project categories in the RFFA Program Direction should be included in all scenarios, as diversifying federal leverage opportunities would enhance the overall effectiveness of the bond package.
- **Ensuring Minimum Funding Levels for Key Projects**: one TPAC member raised concerns regarding the TV Highway Transit Project, stating that \$30 million is the minimum needed for the project to proceed effectively. Similar concerns were raised for 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, where reduced allocations could influence the feasibility of securing additional local matching funds.
- **Financial Strategy and Risk Management**: one TPAC member questioned the financial implications of issuing an \$84 million bond, particularly in terms of debt service obligations and long-term costs, with the impact on RFFA Step 2 allocations, calculating that the bond would cost between \$137 and \$139 million over 12 years.
- **Scenario Refinements and Additional Data Needs**: several TPAC members requested more detailed funding strategy insights, including how bond proceeds fit into broader funding plans for each project. Members suggested further coordination with project sponsors to refine cost estimates and funding assumptions for project thresholds, with the need for clear communication to JPACT regarding the risks and benefits of issuing a new bond.

### Next Steps

Metro staff confirmed that they would refine bond scenarios based on TPAC feedback before presenting them to JPACT. In addition, Metro promised to follow up with project sponsors to make sure that funding requests are realistic and scalable. Thirdly, Metro will continue to clarify long-term financial impacts of the bond to provide JPACT with a clearer picture of the total cost of the bond and annual debt service payments.

## FOOD FOR THOUGHT

- A continued emphasis will need to be prioritized on the importance of including multiple project types in potential bond scenarios to ensure that the full RFFA program direction and JPACT discussions are incorporated.

## Resolution 25-5463, Amending Three Related Rose Quarter Improvement Projects to the 2024-27 MTIP

### Financial and Process Overview of the Amendment

Metro staff introduced a new MTIP amendment for the I-5 Rose Quarter project. Because it requires a different approval process, this amendment is separate from the regular MTIP bundle. The financial details of the amendment originate from the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) approval of \$250 million for three projects related to the Rose Quarter – (1) non-construction project \$12.5 million allocated, (2) Broadway to Wheeler Phase 1 \$177.5 million allocated, and (3) Rose Quarter Phase 1A \$60 million allocated. The amendment process involved proof of funding verification from the OTC, project-level modeling reviews to confirm consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan, and Federal Highway Administration approval to ensure alignment with federal funding requirements.

### Project Overview and Phasing

The Rose Quarter Improvement Project is structured to be implemented in multiple phases to align with funding availability and construction feasibility in the following phase:

#### **Phase 1A (starting 2025)**

- \$60 million investment on early infrastructure projects
- Includes stormwater upgrades under the I-405 interchange and bridge preservation improvements near the I-84 interchange.
- Provides seismic resiliency enhancements and a partial extension of the southbound auxiliary lane from I-34 to Morrison Bridge.
- Emphasis on Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation, using a mini-Construction Management General Contractor model.

#### **Phase 1 (starting 2027)**

- \$177.5 million investment expanding the first section of highway cover from south of Weidler to north of Broadway.
- Incorporates multimodal street enhancements in coordination with the City of Portland's Reconnecting Communities grant project.
- Constructs additional portions of the northbound and southbound auxiliary lands, as well as new sign bridges for improved traffic operations.
- Designed for construction efficiency to minimize community disruption.

### Discussion Points and Next Steps

During discussion, committee members raised concern that the project may negatively influence transit reliability, specifically north-south bus routes such as Line 4 serving equity communities. Another committee member inquired about coordination with the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program (IBRP) to ensure alignment between

the two major infrastructure projects. Lastly, another TPAC member stressed that safety investments should focus on reducing serious injuries and fatalities, not just minor congestion-related incidents.

The formal comment period on this amendment will remain open until March 7, with TPAC expected to take action at the next meeting on the same date. The amendment will then proceed to JPACT (March 20) and Metro Council (April 3) for final approval. Metro and ODOT committed to follow up with TPAC members to address concerns regarding transit impacts, climate modeling methodologies, and alignment with the IBRP.

## **Comprehensive Climate Action Plan (CCAP) Update**

### Summary and Next Steps

Metro presented a Comprehensive Climate Action Plan (CCAP) Update as part of an ongoing effort funded by the EPA's Climate Pollution Reduction Grants. The CCAP is a long-term, 20-year strategy aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions across the broader seven-county metro area, building upon the Priority Climate Action Plan (PCAP) completed in 2024. Metro presented that the CCAP will incorporate an updated emissions inventory, projections of current policies' effects, and a list of priority actions aimed at achieving state and regional climate goals. Given that Oregon's state-level climate targets are expected to be updated to align with Washington's more ambitious reduction goals, Metro staff recommended using Washington's 95% emissions reduction target by 2050 as a benchmark. Additionally, Metro is working closely with regional and state agencies to align the CCAP with existing climate plans, ensuring it complements ongoing efforts such as the Climate Smart Strategy and the Regional Transportation Plan.

Following the presentation, TPAC members provided feedback on measuring climate impacts effectively and ensuring public support for climate policies. Concerns were raised about the effectiveness of using vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a metric for emissions reduction, with members emphasizing the need to track direct greenhouse gas emissions rather than indirect indicators. Some committee members also stressed the importance of clear communication and public engagement, particularly given shifting political landscapes and skepticism around climate policies. Metro staff acknowledged the need for continuous coordination with state and local agencies and next steps include refining the emissions inventory, conducting further greenhouse gas and cost analyses, and presenting a draft list of priority actions at upcoming TPAC meetings in May and July before finalizing CCAP by the end of 2025.

## **2023 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Implementation Update**

### Summary and Next Steps

Metro provided an update of ongoing and upcoming activities related to RTP implementation, highlighting key corridor and project planning efforts, including the Montgomery Park Streetcar Extension, the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Transit Project, and the TV Highway Transit Project. Each of these projects have completed or are nearing completion of locally preferred alternative (LPA) approvals. Additionally, Metro provided updates on ongoing climate-related efforts, such as the CCAP, the Community Connector Transit Study, and the Regional Transportation Demand Management Strategy, which will guide future mobility and emissions reduction strategies. In addition, Metro discussed a collaboration with ODOT on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) methodology, a key requirement under the Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) rules. Other notable projects underway include the Regional Emergency Transportation Routes Phase 2 Study and the Cooling Corridors Study, which focuses on mitigating climate impacts in vulnerable communities.

Looking ahead, Metro will continue working on several key implementation priorities, including updating the Climate Smart Strategy, refining the regional mobility policy, and supporting local transportation system plan (TSP) updates. Metro also noted that they have identified ten corrective actions as part of the state's review of RFP progress, which include improving project evaluation processes, functional plan updates, and refining state

climate targets. A significant upcoming effort is the 2028 RTP update, scheduled for completion by November 30, 2028, which will integrate findings from ongoing climate and mobility studies. TPAC members emphasized the importance of early coordination on regulatory updates, particularly for agencies currently updating their TSPs. Metro committed to work to clarify guidance and timelines to ensure that jurisdictions have the necessary information for future planning and compliance. Next steps include continued stakeholder engagement, data analysis, and policy refinements, with additional updates expected in the coming months.

### Upcoming Agenda Highlights

FEBRUARY 12 – WORKSHOP	MARCH 7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Climate Plan Updates</li> <li>• MetroMap and the Quick Facts Viewer</li> <li>• Cooling Corridors Study Update</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTIP Formal Amendment 25-XXXX Recommendation to JPACT</li> <li>• 2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 1A.1 New Project Bond – Selection of Preferred Scenario/Proposal Recommendation to JPACT</li> <li>• 2028-30 Regional Flexible Fund Step 2 – Risk Assessment Results and Next Steps</li> <li>• Discuss Draft FY 2025-26 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)</li> </ul>
APRIL 4	APRIL 9 -- WORKSHOP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MTIP Formal Amendment 25-XXXX Recommendation to JPACT</li> <li>• Draft FY 2025-26 UPWP Recommendation to JPACT</li> <li>• Community Connector Transit Study: Policy Framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TBD</li> </ul>

### For More Information, Contact Team TPAC

#### COUNTY REPS

Jeff Owen, Clackamas County  
[jowen@clackamas.us](mailto:jowen@clackamas.us)

Karen Buehrig, Clackamas County  
[karenb@clackamas.us](mailto:karenb@clackamas.us)

#### CITY REPS

Will Farley, City of Lake Oswego  
[wfarley@ci.oswego.or.us](mailto:wfarley@ci.oswego.or.us)

Dayna Webb, City of Oregon City  
[dwebb@orc.city.org](mailto:dwebb@orc.city.org)

Laura Terway, City of Happy Valley  
[lterway@happyvalleyor.gov](mailto:lterway@happyvalleyor.gov)

Tanya Battye, City of Milwaukie  
[BattyeT@milwaukieoregon.gov](mailto:BattyeT@milwaukieoregon.gov)