



Accessible

Transportation

Fund Advisory Committee Minutes

Date: Friday, August 7, 2026

Time: 10:04 a.m. to 11:25 a.m.

Meeting Location: Virtual meeting via Zoom

Recording: To request the meeting recording, email bouchard@trimet.org.

Presiding Officer: Jan Campbell, Chair

Attendees

Committee Members and Alternates

- **Jan Campbell (she/her)** - Chair;
Committee on Accessible
Transportation (CAT) member
- **Teresa Christopherson** - Vice
Chair; Clackamas County
- **Annadiana Johnson (they/them)**
- ATFAC and CAT member
- **Mary Lou Ritter** - Washington
County representative for older
adults and people with disabilities
- **Rocky Bixby** - Washington
County representative for older
adults and people with disabilities;
Ride Connection volunteer
- **Andy Nelson** - Ride Connection;
committee member and Chief
Executive Officer
- **Eileen Collins Turvey (she/her)** -
TriMet representative; Director of
Accessible Transportation
Programs
- **Randy Mifflin** - Washington
County Disability, Aging and
Veterans Services; alternate for
Rebecca Miller
- **Alexander Kanso** - Multnomah
County representative
- **Andi Howell** - City of Sandy and
Sandy Area Metro (SAM);
alternate

- **Mike Strauch** - South Clackamas Transportation District; committee member and District Manager
- **Julie Stephens** - Clackamas County representative for older adults and people with disabilities; departed early
- **Franklin Ouchida** - ATFAC and CAT member
- **Kelsey Lewis** - City of Wilsonville and South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART); Grants and Programs Manager
- **Dave Daley** - Multnomah County representative for older adults and people with disabilities; joined late

TriMet Staff

- **Tom Mills** - Director of Mobility Planning and Policy

- **Justin Trubiani** - Senior Administrator, Service Planning
- **Alex Page** - Planner, Service Planning
- **David Bouchard** - Administrative Assistant, Service Planning
- **Kittie Kong** - Senior Community Engagement Coordinator
- **Charlie Clark** - Accessible Transportation Programs
- **JP Gonzalez** - Grants Department

Partner Agency Staff and Guests

- **Dean Orr** - Ride Connection
- **Emily Motter** - Ride Connection
- **Jill Nickerson** - Ride Connection
- **Diana Kotler** - City of Wilsonville and South Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART)
- **Kristina Babcock** - Clackamas County

Minutes

Call to Order and Agenda Overview

- Jan opened the meeting at approximately 10:04 a.m. and facilitated introductions. She welcomed participants, acknowledged the wildfire smoke affecting the region, and encouraged everyone to take care of themselves. Teresa served as Vice Chair and supported Jan in facilitating the meeting.
- Justin reviewed the agenda: introductions, public comment, an update on Oregon Public Meetings Law and prior meeting records, continued work on the STIF Population

funding methodology, and closing. The group planned to conclude near 11:20 a.m. because several participants needed to leave early.

Public Comment

- Justin reported that no written public comments had been received. Jan invited comments from anyone attending the meeting. No one requested to speak, and the committee proceeded to the next agenda item.

Public Meeting Law and Meeting Records Update

- Justin reviewed the meeting-record requirements associated with ORS 192.650. He said TriMet had shared a file containing prior ATFAC recordings and transcripts and was converting the transcripts into written minutes. TriMet was also preparing to post the records online but was still evaluating the most accessible platform. Options included the existing file location and YouTube.
- Because ATFAC meetings were occurring in close succession, Justin said processing recordings, transcripts, and minutes would generally take one to two weeks. Minutes from the preceding meeting had been received and would be distributed after the meeting. To request the recording of this meeting, email bouchard@trimet.org. Justin said he would notify the committee when the website had been updated. No questions were raised.

STIF Population Funding Methodology

- Justin resumed the committee's work on a formulaic method for distributing Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) Population Formula funds. The funds are intended to support transportation projects for older adults and people with disabilities. Staff reminded the group that the displayed figures were estimates and had been rounded; the committee was reviewing the proposed process rather than final provider awards.

ODOT Clarification and Step 1 County Funding

- At the prior meeting, Annadiana had asked whether STIF Population funds had to be distributed in the same county in which the underlying population-based amount was generated. Justin reported that TriMet had asked the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for guidance. ODOT identified two requirements for TriMet as

the qualified entity: eligible projects must serve older adults and people with disabilities outside TriMet's district boundaries in the surrounding counties within TriMet's area of responsibility, and out-of-district projects must be funded in proportion to the out-of-district population.

- ODOT further clarified that the rules do not require the funds to be distributed in the same county in which the population amount was generated. Staff described tracking each county's out-of-district amount as a practical way to ensure that at least the required proportional amount supports out-of-district service. TriMet believed the proposed Step 1 methodology met ODOT's requirements because it separated funds by county, distributed TriMet in-district funds according to each county's share of older adults and people with disabilities, and incorporated the county out-of-district amounts. Jan confirmed that the out-of-district spending requirement must always be met, and Annadiana thanked staff for obtaining the clarification.

Committee Direction on Step 1

- **Motion:** Kelsey moved that the committee accept Step 1 of the methodology. Eileen seconded.
- Andy asked whether the committee intended to address and support each component separately or wait to consider the full methodology. Julie and Eileen supported acting on Step 1 because the county allocation concept appeared settled and doing so would allow the group to concentrate on areas of disagreement. Jan concluded that the committee would proceed step by step. No member indicated opposition or abstention, and the motion carried.

Step 2 Data Sources and Proposed Ride Categories

- Step 2 would use a cost-per-ride calculation to develop a base allocation for providers within each county. Justin explained that staff had evaluated National Transit Database (NTD) data at the committee's request but found it unsuitable as the main reporting variable. The most recent NTD figures were from fiscal year 2024; not every funded provider reports to NTD; NTD demand-response totals can include rides outside the populations or programs funded through ATFAC; and combining NTD and STIF reports

could duplicate rides. Staff could provide the NTD figures on request, but proposed relying on STIF reporting and two supplemental ride categories.

- Staff proposed counting three types of activity:
 - **STIF Periodic Report rides** - Completed trips for older adults and people with disabilities reported by funded providers. Staff proposed using actual fiscal year 2026 totals and doubling them as an estimate for fiscal year 2027 so the calculation covers the full biennium.
 - **Travel-training rides** - Estimated fixed-route trips made possible when STIF-funded travel training enabled an older adult or person with a disability to use fixed-route transit instead of demand-response service. Staff proposed counting these as full rides and limiting the calculation to activity associated with programs funded through the current ATFAC process.
 - **Network-management rides** - Trips for which one organization completed intake, planning, scheduling, training, marketing, or other coordination while another organization operated the vehicle. Staff initially used the term 'initiated rides' and proposed crediting one-third of a ride to the coordinating organization and two-thirds to the direct-service provider.
- Andy recommended using 'network management,' the terminology in the Coordinated Transportation Plan, rather than 'initiated rides.' Staff agreed to revise the slides. Justin also corrected a point that arose during discussion: the proposed fractional credit applied only to network management, not to travel training. The one-third and two-thirds split was an initial proposal and had not been accepted.

Reporting, Shared-Ride Credit, and Double-Counting

- Rocky asked whether providers currently split credit for coordinated rides and whether the proposed method would create additional administrative work. Staff said STIF Periodic Report (SPR) data are self-reported and there is not currently a consistent shared-ride convention. The proposed split was intended to prevent the same trip from being counted twice. Most of the work to match coordinated and operated trips would fall to TriMet, although staff would need data and clarification from Ride Connection and other providers.

- Julie emphasized that the public transit providers in Clackamas County independently perform the intake, dispatch, marketing, training, staffing, and operating functions required for their services. She opposed assigning any portion of those providers' rides to Ride Connection merely because Ride Connection performs network-management functions for other partner organizations. Andy responded that STIF funds eligible activity within counties rather than agencies as such. Julie also noted that several Clackamas providers conduct their own travel training, even when those programs are supported with other funding.
- Eileen questioned the basis for treating network-management work as one-third of a trip and said the proportion appeared high if it was being used as a proxy for overhead. She also warned that a provider could effectively be paid twice if a network-coordination project were funded in full while a portion of another provider's operating allocation was also redirected to the same coordination work. She asked staff to distinguish network coordination, direct operations, preventive maintenance, capital and technology projects, and other overhead so that the methodology would compare like activities and avoid double payment.
- TriMet staff said the proposed fraction was open for revision and invited providers to suggest a more supportable percentage. Staff also explained that the formula would establish an allocation before providers submitted project applications; the recipient would then determine which of its eligible projects to advance within that allocation. Discussion remained unresolved about how the formula should treat a former partner leaving a coordinated network or a completely new provider without prior ride history. Tom cautioned against unnecessary duplication of providers, and Andy noted that the Coordinated Transportation Plan prioritizes preservation of existing services.

Travel-Training Estimates and County Assignment

- Eileen requested a transparent, defensible method for estimating the number of fixed-route rides resulting from travel training. Staff said the estimates should be tied to people trained and activity completed during fiscal year 2026, with a reasonable fiscal year 2027 projection, rather than lifetime ride assumptions. For this calculation, only travel training funded through ATFAC would be included. Staff believed Ride Connection was the only

current STIF Population-funded travel-training program and said they would work with Andy to document its method.

- Before leaving the meeting, Julie said the illustrative formula appeared likely to produce major reductions for South Clackamas Transportation District and SMART. She emphasized that both providers use these funds for services originally created for older adults and people with disabilities and said the final approach must not produce the results shown without further adjustment. Eileen asked whether SMART could also access Washington County funds because its service reaches the Tualatin Park and Ride. Staff agreed that SMART could be eligible in both Clackamas and Washington counties based on where rides are provided and said TriMet would work with Kelsey to assign its rides appropriately between the two counties.

County Flexibility and Cost-per-Ride Concerns

- Kelsey said the proposed methodology was becoming highly complex and questioned whether the added complexity would improve service for older adults and people with disabilities. She also cautioned that using current STIF-funded rides and allocations as the foundation for the next cycle could carry existing funding patterns forward. Because counties have different geography, programs, and service needs, she suggested allowing different allocation methods by county.
- Kelsey described a possible Clackamas County approach in which providers would use the county amount established through Step 1, jointly develop project proposals and requested amounts, and bring those projects to the full ATFAC for review. She clarified that providers would not make a final allocation decision without committee oversight. Mike supported the concept, explaining that Clackamas providers meet regularly, understand one another's programs and needs, and have a history of successfully coordinating the county's funding.
- Mary Lou questioned whether cost per ride should be a controlling factor when rural geography and different service models naturally produce different costs. Eileen responded that county-specific costs and service models do vary, but a cost-per-trip measure could still help distribute limited funds equitably, discourage inefficient delivery, and support more service for a growing population. She cautioned that the

bylaws call for the full committee, including members with lived experience, to evaluate projects rather than leaving allocation solely to providers within each county.

- TriMet staff proposed a middle path: apply the formula to create a transparent base allocation for each provider, then allow providers within a county to adjust those amounts by mutual agreement. If all affected providers agreed, TriMet was open to the change; if they could not reach agreement, the formula-based amounts would remain. Kelsey said that option would be acceptable to SMART, and staff agreed that it reflected the same general objective while preserving a base allocation.

TriMet and ATFAC Roles

- As the discussion turned to whether the committee was approving the methodology, Tom clarified the governance structure. Under the STIF rules, TriMet is the qualified entity and is responsible for creating the allocation process. ATFAC participates as an advisory work group and provides recommendations, concerns, and subject-matter expertise, but it is not the final decision-maker on the process. Tom said TriMet intended to retain a formulaic method while remaining open to committee input and mutually agreed county adjustments. The motions taken during the meeting therefore documented the committee's advisory direction rather than final adoption of TriMet's methodology.

Multnomah County Provider Impacts

- After joining the meeting, Dave questioned the large difference between the illustrative results for Asian Health and Service Center and Metropolitan Family Service. He said the organizations have substantially different service models and that a sizable increase for one provider alongside a sizable decrease for the other suggested the formula was missing important context. Staff said the projections reflected reported SPR rides and current funded amounts. Dave recommended a facilitated Multnomah County discussion to examine the service-model differences and reconcile the results. Staff was open to facilitation and said post-formula coordination among county providers could be used to adjust allocations by agreement.

Committee Direction on Step 2

- **Motion:** Eileen moved to hold off on approving Step 2 until a formula had been identified for each type of funding being requested. Dave seconded the motion, and Alexander also expressed support.
- In restating the motion, Eileen explained that the committee needed a method that separately and consistently addressed network coordination and other overhead, direct-service operations, preventive maintenance, capital, and technology. This was necessary to avoid double-counting and to compare the region's varied delivery models fairly. No member indicated opposition or abstention, and the motion carried. Step 2 remained unresolved for continued discussion.

Next Meeting and Adjournment

- The next ATFAC meeting was scheduled for Friday, August 14, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. Before that meeting, Justin planned to update the agenda and slides, replace 'initiated rides' with 'network management,' work with Ride Connection on a travel-training estimate, and return with additional methodology for the unresolved ride-counting and funding-type questions. Jan and Teresa planned to discuss how best to facilitate the next meeting in light of TriMet's clarification of ATFAC's advisory role and the committee's step-by-step motions.
- Teresa thanked participants for the frank and substantive discussion. She observed that the region's service models are not directly comparable and said the discussion was helping identify where they are similar, where they differ, and how the group might find a path forward. Jan thanked everyone and concluded the meeting at approximately 11:25 a.m.