

Accessible Transportation Fund Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes - STIF Population Meeting 1

July 29, 2026

Meeting time: 10:00-11:30 a.m.

Call to order: 10:06 a.m.

Adjournment: 11:29 a.m.

Location: Virtual meeting via Zoom

Chair: Jan Campbell

Quorum: Confirmed

Attendance

Committee Members and Alternates

Jan Campbell, Chair

Annadiana Johnson

Dave Daley

Kristina Babcock, Clackamas County, alternate for Teresa Christopherson

Julie Stephens, Clackamas County representative for older adults and people with disabilities

Mary Lou Ritter

Randy Mifflin, Washington County Disability, Aging and Veteran Services, alternate for Rebecca Miller

Eileen Collins Turvey, TriMet Accessible Transportation Programs

Kelsey Lewis, Wilsonville SMART

Franklin Ouchida

Rocky Bixby, Ride Connection volunteer and Washington County representative

Mike Strauch, South Clackamas Transportation District

Andy Nelson, Ride Connection

Rebecca Miller, Washington County Area Agency on Aging

TriMet Staff

Kittie Kong, Community Engagement

Justin Trubiani

Alex Page

David Bouchard, Service Planning

JP Gonzalez

Guests and Observers

Andi Howell, Sandy Area Metro

Emily Motter, Ride Connection

John Mira, Ride Connection

Eve Nilenders, Multnomah County

Margretta Hansen, Multnomah County Aging, Disability and Veterans Services

Confirmed absent: Teresa Christopherson, Clackamas County.

Call to Order and Agenda

Jan Campbell called the meeting to order at approximately 10:06 a.m. Justin Trubiani confirmed that a quorum was present. Members, alternates, staff, and observers introduced themselves. Jan reviewed the agenda and noted that the meeting would end by 11:30 a.m.

Public Comment

Justin reported that no written public comments had been received. He checked for raised hands among attendees, and no one requested to speak. The committee proceeded without public comment.

Oregon Government Ethics Commission Public Meeting Law Training

Justin explained that ATFAC is a work group of the HB 2017 Transit Advisory Committee. As public officials serving on a public committee, ATFAC members must comply with Oregon Public Meetings Law and complete the Oregon Government Ethics Commission public meeting law training before the end of their terms. He said the training information would be redistributed and that members generally had about two years remaining in their current terms.

Kelsey Lewis, who had completed the training, raised concerns about substantive committee deliberation by group email. She distinguished routine scheduling messages from discussion that should occur in a publicly accessible setting and also noted that public bodies must provide a way to submit grievances concerning public meeting law compliance.

The committee discussed practical ways to preserve transparency between meetings. Rebecca Miller suggested including relevant written exchanges with the meeting record. Dave Daley suggested sending individual comments to Justin so staff could present them for consideration during the next public meeting. The committee's direction was to avoid substantive deliberation by group email and bring policy discussion forward in public meetings.

Andy Nelson asked whether ATFAC minutes were available and whether the committee should review them. Justin said prior minutes were being compiled and would be posted after website updates were completed. He also said he would confirm whether ATFAC must formally review and approve minutes and, if required, add that step to future agendas.

STIF Population Funding Methodology

Purpose and Funding Outlook

Justin presented a proposed formula for allocating Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund Population funds. He repeatedly emphasized that the methodology, ridership figures, reimbursement amounts, and potential awards were illustrative and had not been finalized. The purpose of a formulaic approach would be to make awards more timely, adapt automatically to changing revenue projections, give providers greater flexibility to budget among eligible projects, and align the process more closely with the HB 2017 Transit Advisory Committee's review structure.

The latest projection increased available STIF Population funding by approximately \$180,000. Including unspent funds, the total shown was \$11,974,690. Justin noted that no STIF Human Services funds were available for this cycle and that ODOT could issue another projection before the allocation process concluded.

Step 1: Illustrative County Funding

The proposed first step would allocate the \$10,818,915 generated within the TriMet District according to each county's share of older adults and people with disabilities living inside the district. The allocation would then add the STIF Population funds generated outside the TriMet District in each county: \$853,163 for Clackamas County, \$265,028 for Washington County, and \$37,584 for Multnomah County.

County	Population in TriMet District	Share of Total	Illustrative County Funding
Clackamas	91,797	19.5%	\$2,965,615
Washington	149,395	31.7%	\$3,702,938
Multnomah	228,946	48.7%	\$5,306,138
Total	470,138	100.0%	\$11,974,690

Note: The county figures were displayed as provisional presentation values. Rounded county amounts may not sum exactly to the displayed total.

Eileen Collins Turvey and Kristina Babcock clarified the slide labels and confirmed that the county-specific amounts represented funds generated in each county outside the TriMet District. Rebecca distinguished this treatment from STIF payroll funds, which are distributed differently. Justin explained that STIF Population funds had historically been combined into one regional pool and that the proposed county framework was intended to mirror the HB 2017 process more closely.

Members expressed general comfort with using the target population in each county as a starting point, but no vote was taken. Kelsey noted that Wilsonville spans two counties and that SMART's medical trips often cross county lines. Kristina emphasized that rural and outlying Clackamas County residents often have no fixed-route, paratransit, ride-hailing, or community transportation alternatives. Annadiana Johnson asked whether

state requirements direct STIF Population funds back to the county where they were generated. Justin agreed to confirm the requirement with Jennifer Cooper at ODOT.

Step 2: Illustrative Ride Counts

Justin then presented estimated completed and projected fiscal year 2026 and 2027 rides for older adults and people with disabilities. The figures had been collected about six months earlier to demonstrate how the formula might work. They had not been validated and could include different ATFAC funding sources, differing interpretations of the request, and provider services that crossed county boundaries.

Provider	Washington County	Clackamas County	Multnomah County
South Clackamas Transportation District	-	6,432	-
Canby Area Transit	-	19,716	-
Wilsonville SMART	-	3,641	-
Clackamas County	-	81,136	-
Sandy Area Metro	-	29,686	-
Multnomah County	-	-	55,086
Ride Connection	113,629	20,654	197,052
Total	113,629	161,265	252,138

Note: These were illustrative estimates, not accepted ridership figures or final inputs to an allocation decision.

Julie Stephens questioned the 20,654 Ride Connection trips attributed to Clackamas County. Kristina explained that Ride Connection supplies some vehicles to senior-center partners, while Clackamas County bears operating and administrative costs and reports those trips to the National Transit Database. Andy said Ride Connection's network also serves Clackamas County, cited Providence PACE as a possible contributor, and agreed to verify and provide a complete partner-level breakdown. Justin redirected the discussion toward establishing consistent ride-counting standards before resolving the individual figures.

Ride-Counting and Data-Quality Standards

Members agreed that the current ride estimates were not sufficiently consistent for use in an award formula. The discussion identified the following issues for staff to resolve:

- Use National Transit Database reporting where available, while recognizing that Ride Connection subrecipient trips may not be reported there.
- Use STIF quarterly reports to identify projects funded with STIF Population or STIF Human Services funds and the reported rides by older adults and people with disabilities.

- Confirm the figures with each provider and establish a common definition of an eligible ride.
- Determine whether the formula should count only STIF Population-funded rides or also rides supported by STIF Human Services, Section 5310, or other ATFAC funding. Kelsey favored limiting the calculation to STIF Population-funded rides because those were the funds being allocated.
- Address mixed-use services where providers cannot readily distinguish older adults and people with disabilities from general-public riders.
- Avoid double-counting trips supported through braided funding, including Medicaid, regional coordination funds, Section 5310, and Title XIX match arrangements.
- Distinguish operating support from vehicle provision, scheduling, travel training, and other program components so the same trip is not credited to more than one entity or funding purpose.
- Display every grantee and Ride Connection network partner separately before rolling results up by county.

No final ride definition, data source, or eligible-funding rule was adopted at this meeting.

Illustrative Reimbursement Rates and Equity Considerations

Using the unvalidated ride estimates, the proposal divided each county's illustrative funding amount by that county's rides. Eileen recommended describing the result as a reimbursement rate rather than an actual cost per ride.

County	Illustrative Funding	Illustrative Rides	Rate per Ride
Clackamas	\$2,965,615	161,265	\$18.39
Washington	\$3,702,938	113,629	\$32.59
Multnomah	\$5,306,138	252,138	\$21.04

Note: The committee did not approve these rates.

Kristina argued that county-specific rates could penalize providers that use volunteers, combine passengers into group trips, or otherwise deliver more rides efficiently. She asked staff to test a single regional rate based on the total funding pool and total eligible rides. Justin agreed to run that alternative.

Dave recommended showing each grantee's current award, rides, and resulting rate individually before producing county totals. He said provider-level information would make differences in service design and efficiency visible. Rebecca supported the earlier county population framework but did not support the county reimbursement-rate calculation as presented; she said each provider should explain how it would use the funds and whom it would serve.

Eileen emphasized that equity analysis should recognize longer medical and essential trips from outlying parts of Clackamas and Washington counties. She also suggested considering outreach to additional eligible providers and underserved communities if

county-level funding indicates service gaps. Julie noted that the historic project-by-project review had rarely resulted in requested amounts being reduced and supported continued work toward a more streamlined process.

The committee did not reach the proposed mileage variable or final-award steps in detail. Julie asked that mileage remain part of the next discussion, and Justin confirmed that staff would return to a mileage adjustment intended to recognize trip distance.

No formal motions or votes were taken on the proposed methodology.

Next Meeting and Adjournment

The next ATFAC STIF Population meeting was scheduled for Friday, August 7, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. Justin said he would circulate supporting information before the meeting. Rebecca advised that she would be unavailable for the August 7 and August 14 meetings; she and Randy would coordinate so she could remain current, and she requested the minutes from both meetings.

Jan adjourned the meeting at 11:29 a.m.