KITTELSON & ASSOCIATES

Meeting Notes

Transportation Planning Guides Update

TSP Guidelines Technical Advisory Committee (TSP-TAC) Meeting #4

November 16, 2023 | 8:00 – 10:00 AM

Microsoft Teams Meeting: **Click here to join the meeting**

Attend.	Name	Org.	Attend.	Name	Org.
☒	Theresa Conley	ODOT	☒	Angela Rogge	DEA
☒	Zachary Horowitz	ODOT	☒	Lisa Scherf	City of Corvallis
☐	Brian Hurley	ODOT	☒	Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
☒	Michael Baker	ODOT	☒	Julie Hanson	City of Salem
☒	Lisa Cornutt	ODOT	☒	Karl MacNair	City of Medford
☐	Donald Morehouse	ODOT	☒	Joseph Auth	City of Hillsboro
☒	Glen Bolen	ODOT	☒	Elisa Cheng	Bend Bikes
☒	Mark Bernard	ODOT	☐	Emma Land	Oregon Health Authority
☐	Elizabth Ledet	ODOT	☒	Susie Wright	Kittelson
☒	Robin Wilcox	ODOT	☐	Matt Bell	Kittelson
☒	David Hirsch	ODOT	☒	Molly McCormick	Kittelson
☐	Dominique Huffman	ODOT	☒	Darci Rudzinski	MIG
☒	Bill Holstrom	DLCD			

Guests: Ken Shonkwiler, ODOT; Bryan Graveline, PBOT; Erik Havig, ODOT

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of TSP-TAC Meeting #3 is to provide an overview of comments received on Draft Bundle 1 of the TSP Guidelines edits and to review Draft Bundle 2.

Agenda:

1. Project Overview and Status Update (15 min)
   a. Background
   b. Project Objectives
   c. Schedule
   d. Overview of TSP Guidelines Update Strategy
2. Comments Received on the Bundle 2 Edits and Remaining Discussion Items (15 min)
3. Summary of Bundle 3 Edits (60 min)
   a. Are the edits and structure clear and implementable?
   b. Do you have a different interpretation of the TPR changes and how they impact the TSP Guidelines?
   c. Did the team miss any items to adjust in these sections?
4. General Discussion (20 min)
5. Next Steps (10 min)

Notes:

Introductory sections

No comments.

Bundle 2 Updates

No comments.

Introduction/Background

Comment: is there a "when" element that discusses how often, even if not a hard requirement?

Response: Theresa added the "when" page of the guidelines to the chat

Comment: Can there be some extracted examples/images from the example TSPs instead of a block of text about what the TSP did well?

Response: Good feedback. It may be outside the scope of this project, but can be addressed as the updated TSPs are added.

Comment: How to – had a description about shall, should, could but then said must? Is it because it isn't strictly from the TPR?

Response: the team will check this and consider if want to keep it as must or change to shall.

Comment: Lisa Scherf has a typo to share

Response: Please email to Theresa

Phases

Comment: typo on page 18 – should be no increase vs no include

Response: Will address

Comment: Do we have enough info about how the scenario work flows into the TSP update?

Response: When we send the next packet, we may highlight where we think it is addressed so people can have that extra focus and better respond to this question.

Comment: Think a lot of it makes sense and at a good level for the guidelines. The one thing is that the terms can be hard to track, so a definitions page would be helpful

Response: good comment.

Comment: Which audiences are we trying to get at? Especially local jurisdictions where someone wears like 6 hats, will they get it? Don't see jumping out: the local jurisdictions set what they want. There are requirements, but there is flexibility within that. The TSP process sets a vision and then you go through a process to try to meet that vision. The local person needs to be able to tell that story, help to tie it back to implementation when actually asking for funding to implement. We are doing this not to check boxes and requirements but to fulfil the vision and gain support of the community for projects.

Response: The outline of the website starts with high-level and then gets down to the practitioner level. Maybe the "implement" section could better discuss this, instead of focusing so much on the tracking.

Comment: Page P-17, responding to whether the reporting piece makes sense to me. I don't understand if the county needs to do this. Is an annual report different than a minor report or a major report? It is difficult to know based on the current text. If within Metro, it says Metro is responsible for coordinating, does that mean they are responsible for the minor and/or major reports?

Response: The annual report is either minor or major. Good comment to better clarify for metro.

DLCD Response: Metro as the MPO is responsible to do the reporting.

Comment: P-10 amending your TSP has new text added. TSP is just one type of land use decision made by the jurisdiction. Is the VMT/capita requirement for any land use decision?

Response: This is a tricky piece. It is addressed in the revised TPR, related to -0210. Implementation of that section is currently on pause. DLCD heard a lot about -0210, since there could be different interpretations of it since it was initially written very broadly. They have been tweaking it this past year but recognize there is still work needed. They came to the decision that they won't be able to fix it in 2023. They punted the issue to 2027 and the intention is to update the language before the rule comes into effect.

Maybe the team can soften the language of that sentence or recognize what Bill just shared.

Comment: page 15 on managing parking. Didn't like the "accommodate"; maybe "providing" is better. Reads that we need to accommodate SOV parking needs vs try to balance them against other priorities. Can send specific language to Theresa.

Response: good comment

Comment: Confused by the "may" in the project programming sentence about VMT/capita analysis

Response: good comment. Need to be more clear.

Comment: -0160 review of VMT/capita is still in place before 2027, just -0210 is pushed back

Comment: last sentence of the PDF, didn't like how positive it is about these electric wheeled devices. They can be threatening to pedestrians. Will share a different language with Theresa.

Response: yes, please provide the text edit.

Comment: P-10, can we add quasi-judicial amendments to what is in the additional analysis.

Response: team to work with Bill about softening the language, adding a note that it is upcoming, and don't have the full direction on that at this point

Some of this questions on quasi-judicial amendments might be more covered in the dev-rev updates occurring.

Comment: Who would be the lead on appealing to LUBA if there was questions about how a TSP was done or amendments to the TSP?

> Response: Probably depends on who is thinking there is an issue. Could be anyone. If asking more if a state department is thinking the TSP does not meet the requirements, if DLCD would be the director and then the commission would have to approve. And for ODOT, it is the ODOT director.

> Response: This could be an issue when we have to "coordinate" with existing TSPs. If a local agency has a county roadway going through their area that they don't agree with the project in the county's TSP.

Comment: Central Lane MPO's RTP has a VMT/capita reduction requirement. And x city has done a nodal approach to development to try to meet it. But they are struggling to meet it. Encourage you to look into it.

> Response: think this is a scenario planning issue, not necessarily in the TSP guidelines. Could maybe add it to the tracking piece – are you meeting this? if not, follow this loop of steps

Comment: -0210 language, hadn't been aware of that change to 2027 until today. We were planning to update Medford TSP in 2025. Seems like an important aspect of the TSP, so concerned if don't have that guidance and if things keep changing. Jurisdictions are trying to comply with the new rule and it makes it more difficult

> Response: noted.

Comment: Related to notifying other jurisdictions. Indicate a notice to ODOT should occur as well. It has happened where agencies have updated their TSPs that include state facilities and ODOT got no notice.

> Response: good comment.

Step 5 – Developing & Evaluating Solutions

Comment: there is a miscommunication that -0830 is trying to mean that you can't do these projects. This is more about making an informed decision. At the end of the day, the local agency is the decision maker. The flow chart has that but could use a note about it above as well.

> Response: good comment

Comment: Appreciate the -0830 chart. How this is done for projects on regional facilities, specifically ODOT facilities, is still a question for a local or regional TSP? As a county, we carry regional projects in our TSP. Is it then the county's responsibility to do this enhanced review process? Or is it ODOT's responsibility to conduct enhanced review for state facilities?

> Response: For the TSP program where ODOT is providing funding for local jurisdictions, we should see that happening in the TSP process and build it into the scope/budget. If the local jurisdiction is going on their own, then we need to discuss it. For state facilities, the decision

does go back to the transportation commission. It is easier if partnering with ODOT, need more coordination if going alone.

Comment: there won't be a one-size-fits-all approach for this with the overlapping jurisdictions. Don't want to be too specific.

Response: good comment.

Comment: If we expect to go through NEPA on a project, do you still have to do the -0830 process?

Response: Yes. All TSP projects need to address-0830 if applicable, then go through NEPA but if NEPA is already done or there's already been a PEL, see if -0830 criteria already addressed. Will consider an FAQ on how this could work in different scenarios.

Comment: We (Hillsboro) have ongoing concern with previously planned projects. We heavily rely on developers to complete these types of projects. The revised TPR does not have this exception recognized. It would cost the city 10's of millions of dollars. Would like response on comments provided to the RAC.

Comment: Enhanced review flowchart, could use some FAQs. Would also be useful to say that this is the typical, but planning from other efforts can be brought in to check off some of this process

Response: If relying on previous planning, just make sure it checks the intention of the step. No problem leveraging past work or building on it. There will always be some nuance on that. You don't have to start brand new, just that the steps need to be covered.

Comment: When to do the review, are there limitations on the NEPA exception? For example, Highway 22 has a late 80's decision.

Response: if it is still valid, then yes. But most aren't valid after 10 years or so. Might need to clarify.

Comment: Characteristics box with less than $5 million – seems weird compared to the other ones. Came from the TPR?

Response: Yes.

Comment: Consistency with other plans is laced throughout step 5, but not a lot of detail about what that means. Definition on gap analysis is causing a lot of questions as well. Local streets are mentioned, what level do they go to? Want to spend money on implementation, not on hyper analyzing gaps. Some guidance to make those trade-off decisions on how far into the detail to go.

Response: Good comment.

Meeting Chat:
[8:05 AM] HOROWITZ Zachary

Go Beavs!

like 1
[8:06 AM] HOROWITZ Zachary

Go soup!

[8:19 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

Link to the current and revised TPR - https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Documents/TPR_2023.pdf

[8:31 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Planning/TSP-Guidelines/Pages/When.aspx

Oregon Department of Transportation : When to update a Transportation System Plan? :
Transportation System Plan Guidelines : State of Oregon
Information on when to update a Transportation System Plan, or TSP. Includes information on
Transportation Planning Rule requirements, specific examples of what might trigger an update, and
how lon...
[8:34 AM] Karl H. MacNair

Theresa's link addressed my comment

like 1
[8:35 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

Elisa Cheng, would it be helpful to have fewer examples and to extract more information from those
examples (as you were describing)?

[8:36 AM] Elisa Cheng

Yes, that is exactly what I was getting at! Thanks 🤪

like 1
[8:37 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

ODOT staff will be continuing to 'refresh' the TSP examples parallel to this project so this is something
we can work to incorporate / address over time with those updates. Thanks for the feedback!

like 1
[8:49 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

We revisted the 'Why' page earlier in the project - https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Planning/TSP-
Guidelines/Pages/Why.aspx

Oregon Department of Transportation : Why Update a Transportation System Plan? : Transportation
System Plan Guidelines : State of Oregon

[8:49 AM] BOLEN Glen A

thanks Thresa I'll refesh my memory on that

[8:50 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

And at meeting #5 we'll be able to take a more holistic look at everything and make sure the pieces all pull together

[8:50 AM] Elisa Cheng

CONLEY Theresa L, do you know when this website launched?

[8:51 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

We plan to launch the updates in early 2024 (Jan/Feb)

[8:52 AM] Joseph Auth

The rule says Metro not cities and counties.

[8:52 AM] Joseph Auth

...within Metro for reporting.

[8:53 AM] HOLMSTROM Bill * DLCD

Metro is responsible for reporting for the Portland metropolitan area, not the individual cities and counties.

[9:00 AM] BOLEN Glen A

Great point Lisa.

[9:02 AM] BOLEN Glen A

The space and cost required to provide parking has significant impact to development pro forma and the monthly rent for tenants

[9:03 AM] Buehrig, Karen

I agree with Lisa, there should be more specificity on when the additional analysis would be needed.

[9:30 AM] BAKER Michael

The CFEC rules apply to metropolitan cities, including their UGB. The remaining county area does not need to follow the enhanced review.

like 1
[9:31 AM] BAKER Michael

Metro may be different

[9:44 AM] Joseph Auth

DLCD - Please address my comment. It is a big concern.

[9:48 AM] BOLEN Glen A

Joseph, are you thinking about projects such as the extension of Cornelius Pass into South Hillsboro?

[9:49 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

Julie Hanson we can think of ways to neatly incorporate additional information/nuance into here, perhaps as hover-over boxes.

[9:49 AM] Joseph Auth

That is one example.

like 1
[9:49 AM] Joseph Auth

regarding Glen's comment.

[9:49 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

Also, we can emphasize that - as long as a jurisdiction complies with Rule - it is a local process and a local decision whether to authorize the project

like 1
[9:51 AM] Joseph Auth

We have invested millions on design and tax credits for developers to dedicate right-of-way and/or build a partial project, we should not go back and reanalyze whether the project is needed.

[9:52 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

SHONKWILER Kenneth D, the -830 bullet points are directly from Rule and I believe were developed by DLCD in consideration of feedback and conversation with jurisdictions and interested parties

[9:53 AM] SHONKWILER Kenneth D

Thanks for confirming CONLEY Theresa LTheresa, I see it now in the rule. Doesn't make a ton of sense but that is OK.

[9:57 AM] Julie Hanson
CONLEY Theresa L (External)

Julie Hanson we can think of ways to neatly incorporate additional information/nuance into here, perhaps as hover-over boxes.

I was thinking of a brief introduction (2-3 sentences) to the flow chart talking about ability to pull in word done through previous planning processes if relevant. Can also talk about this could be done stand-alone or as part of a TSP update or in conjunction with environmental review, etc.
[9:58 AM] Karl H. MacNair

I have to go. Happy Thanksgiving to all!

[9:58 AM] Julie Hanson

When you share full set, can you have a clean version and a track changes version?