

**OREGON MODELING STEERING COMMITTEE**  
**ODOT Human Resource Center, Suite C**  
**2775 19th Street SE, Salem, OR**  
**Wednesday, September 21, 2005, 1:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

**ATTENDANCE**

Dick Walker, Chair	Portland Metro
Richard Bjelland	OR Department of Housing & Community Services
Bill Upton	OR Department of Transportation
Jerri Bohard	OR Department of Transportation
Bob Cortright	OR Department of Land Conservation & Development
Carl Switzer	Corvallis Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Bud Reiff	Lane Council of Governments
Mike Jaffe	Mid-Willamette Valley Council of Governments
Matt Hermen	Rogue Valley Council of Governments
Tyler Deke	Bend Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
Shinwon Kim	SW Washington Region Transportation Council
Scott Drumm	Port of Portland
Satvinder Sandhu	Federal Highway Administration
Rob Bertini	Portland State University
Michal Wert	MW Consulting
<b><u>Guests</u></b>	
Brian Dunn	OR Department of Transportation

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Dick Walker welcomed Matt Herman and Satvinder Sandhu as new members of the OMSC. He asked for self-introductions for the benefit of new members.

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Technical Services Subcommittee – Bill Upton, Chair**

Bill Upton stated that the TLUMIP Peer Panel met to review progress on the program. Previously the Panel recommended that the modeling team working on Gen II should simplify its work. This time the Panel felt that the team oversimplified so more work is needed for the Transitional Model (TM).

There was discussion on whether the TM would suffice as the GenII model and the Panel was clear that they expect to see the GenII model go forward. The biggest direction from the Peer Panel was that when allocating households, there is a hard and a soft side - the

modeling team missed the soft side and this needs to be back in the model. This includes things like standard of living indices and crime rate. It will take additional time to include this information in the TM but it will be well underway within the next six months. It is expected that the TM will be ready for application in 6-12 months.

### **Performance Measures Subcommittee – Bud Reiff, Chair**

Bud Reiff stated that the three year joint research project by LCOG, TPAU and the ODOT Research Unit is almost complete. The project identified transportation plans and policies that do not have adequate performance measures to see how well they are being addressed within the plans. An expert review panel helped identify several policy areas that looked like they could be better addressed.

Six performance measures were defined and tested and several policy areas that need additional research were identified for future work. It would be good to have better measures for investment decisions in transportation investment plans. Cost assessment is good but the benefit side is not defined very well. Reliability is an also an important variable. How different transportation planning decisions affect reliability is useful. There is a lot of information on safety from an engineering perspective but not much is known about how decisions at the planning level affect safety.

The six performance measures are recommended to be used in addition to existing policy measures. The mobility and freight delay cost measures are in good shape. There are refinements needed for the other four. The final report will be done in about a month and will be posted on the ODOT website. OMSC members will be notified when it is available.

Mike Jaffe asked if the LCOG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update will use these new measures. Bud stated that the RTP was adopted last December. The next update will be in 2006 and he will recommend that these measures be used in the update.

Shinwon Kim asked if the performance measures require special tools for implementation. Bud stated that some of them were evaluated with the Eugene 4-step model. Others were evaluated with the Medford Jem-in-R model. The intention is to have some models that are folded into the Jem-in-R. Dick noted that several of the measures are time and distance and are stratified and can be used with existing software. The research used variables that are already in the models.

Shinwon noted that the reliability performance measures are complex. Bud stated that microscopic simulation probably provides more information for reliability to see the effects of variability in a corridor. This one was not addressed as part of this project and needs more research.

### **Modeling Program Coordination (MPC) - Mike Jaffe, Chair**

Mike stated that the MPC met in the morning before the OMSC meeting and had two agenda items – MPO/statewide model interface and the COSMO. This report covers the first topic and COSMO is discussed under that agenda item.

MWVCOG, LCOG and Metro prepared a draft discussion paper on the MPO perspective on MPO/statewide model interface issues and opportunities. The paper addresses goals and objectives for using statewide and MPO models and provides a starting point for setting longer term goals for when to use the MPO or the statewide model or both. A follow-up meeting will be held with the MPC and the TLUMIP consultant to talk about MPO and statewide model coordination. Goals for the statewide model need to be reiterated and evaluated regularly and this continues to be a good cooperative program.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **4<sup>th</sup> Oregon Symposium on Integrated Land Use and Transport Models**

Bill stated that the 4<sup>th</sup> Oregon Symposium will be held November 15-17, 2005. The program is a mix of applications and theory and should be interesting to a broad modeling base. Program and registration information are available on the ODOT website at [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Modeling.shtml#4th\\_Oregon\\_Symposium](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Modeling.shtml#4th_Oregon_Symposium). Michal noted that hotel rates will increase \$5 per night beginning October 1 and urged members to register soon.

## **PROGRAM UPDATES**

### **Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) Update**

Jerri Bohard stated that a revised schedule and a web link for technical papers were circulated with the OMSC agenda. A draft document is available that includes goals, policies, strategies, a summary of technical analyses and a technical analysis report. This information is available on the OTP webpage.

The Steering Committee and the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) spent a lot of time talking about key initiatives - priority strategies that they want to move forward. These include maintaining the existing system, optimizing the existing system using technology, new funding, being strategic about investments, integrating transportation planning, and transportation across jurisdictions and modes. There has been a lot of discussion about breaking down silos.

A joint meeting of all policy committee members and the Steering Committee will be held on October 3. This is the last meeting to make comments before the OTC authorizes staff to begin public outreach at its November 16 meeting. Public outreach will occur from mid-November through the end of February.

Public outreach will include discussions with all MPOs and Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs). ODOT is preparing a Request for Proposal to hire a firm to

conduct surveys on the key initiatives and to get thoughts from people who attend public meetings. This will include personal interviews and information on-line. The Steering Committee will meet to discuss this information in March-May 2006. The updated OTP should be ready for adoption in late summer.

Mike asked if the Steering Committee looked at Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) and OTP connections. Jerri stated that there is an indirect connection and they are not inconsistent. The level of specificity for the OTP is different than TPR rule-making, i.e., a revision to the TPR provides details on how to manage interchanges and the OTP talks about how to protect investments made in the transportation infrastructure. The philosophies are consistent.

Mike asked if the OTP addresses the TPR intent to put higher density in corridors. Jerri stated that sustainability is a major focus of the OTP. It may not get to higher density but it talks about land use and transportation and recognizes that density is important for non-auto modes to work. The OTP and TPR are probably the closest in the performance measures.

Richard stated that a key barrier for the transportation system is available financing. Does the OTP look at alternative ways to fund the infrastructure? Jerri stated that the OTP looks at opportunities like public-private partnerships and pricing. Funding is the last of the six key initiatives. More efficiency in breaking down silos between jurisdictions and a better use of money that is limited because of dedicated restrictions right now need to be addressed before asking for new money so funding is the last of the six initiatives.

Richard noted that increased efficiency is good but that will not provide all the money needed to address the deteriorating infrastructure. Jerri stated that the OTP talks about taking care of what we have first and hopefully operations can answer some questions before new capacity is added. The plan recognizes that if there is no new money, Oregon transportation will lose ground and the OTP talks about how to prioritize if there is no new money. This was not done in the last plan. The door is open to more road pricing discussions.

Jerri stated that the OTP Steering Committee realizes that this is not the document to go to the legislature for the next session. Part of the RFP will be putting information together appropriate for the legislature. Richard noted that it is important for legislators to understand that the transport network is losing ground. The amount of money available does not cover the increased costs of right-of-way acquisition let alone costs of materials.

Jerri noted that Oregon did well in the Federal reauthorization but this does not come close to what is needed. Information from local jurisdictions was used as the base for funding for the OTP but this is aggressive.

Jerri offered that ODOT is available for presentations and asked OMSC members to contact her if there are groups that would like a presentation. Information on the OTP and technical papers are available on the OTP website at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ortransplanupdate.shtml>.

### **Continuous Survey Modeling for Oregon (COSMO)**

Mike stated that a Peer Review Panel met to discuss the results of the pilot study and the consultant recommendations for the COSMO project. Most OMSC members were represented at the meeting. During the 1-1/2 day meeting, the consultant team talked about the pros and cons of three collection methods - diary, diary plus personal GPS, and personal GPS. They made the following recommendations:

- Repeated cross-sectional/longitudinal survey. The recommended ratio (2/3 cross-sectional to 1/3 panel) is appropriate but will ultimately depend on sample size and over-sampling in the first year.
- In-vehicle GPS for all respondents; wearable GPS for sub-groups when technology improves – there was an inherent problem with wearable GPS because people forget the unit and reception is an issue.
- GPS data collected for 7 continuous days.
- Diary data for 2 of 7 days, at end of 7 day period.
- Diary data only for non-motorized and transit travel, and passengers in non-instrumented autos.
- Mixed (RDD + Address based) sampling frame – vehicle registration to be pursued as potential source.
- Longitudinal panel to be selected from cross-sectional households.
- Follow persons in longitudinal panel to track household formation, locational decisions.
- Media and public information should access Hispanic and other communities
- Track quality of survey instruments over time.
- Use GPS data for intelligent questions – parking cost, HOV lane use.

Several issues were identified that need to be decided by the OMSC and others:

- Exact mix between cross-sectional and longitudinal sample
- Total recruits per year
- Amount of over-sampling in first year
- Geographic staging of data collection
- Sample stratification
- Periodicity of longitudinal panel
- Number and types of special-purpose “add-ons” – LD travel, health, parking...
- Use of incentives

The wearable GPS has come a long way but it is not ready for prime time. The consultant recommended to do a vehicle GPS instead. This was not tested in the pilot but it works well in other parts of the country and is a proven collection method. If collecting information from the vehicle, a lot more data can easily be acquired for a full seven days and a diary can be kept for two of those days.

There was a lot of discussion on whether this should be a typical cross-section survey where one group is surveyed this year, a different group the next, etc. or whether to conduct a longitudinal panel where the same group is tracked over time to see how changes in life affect decisions. A full report will be available in October and a copy will be sent to all OMSC members.

The MPC met in the morning to talk about the survey to discuss funding, contracting, how to share funds and maximize resources, and how to engage higher level management to support the survey. The MPC is looking at a closely coordinated approach and details need to be worked out by the MPC and the OMSC COSMO Subcommittee. This group will be pulled together soon to start to define the scope of the project and timing.

Dick stated that he is meeting with decision groups in the Metro area. Committees represent cities, counties and others in the metro area. They are asking good questions and are very supportive of doing the survey. The MPC is potentially looking at fall 2006 as the beginning of the first survey. Metro is preparing budgets right now and is trying to line up Metro area funding partners.

There was disappointment that personal GPS units did not work better. People did not turn it on, forgot to take it with them, or put it in a backpack and could not access the satellite. This is the reason that auto GPS was recommended but it will be reconsidered as technology changes over time. An auto GPS does not capture travel by bus or walking and will require a different survey technique to get this data.

Mike noted that there are advances in prototype models all the time and if the contract is over several years, different technology can be considered over time. Richard stated that a hand held unit is working well in Japan but it is not available in the U.S. yet.

Dick stated that this data is important to the transportation community but it also has a lot of use for others. The Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU) is doing research on relationships between health and the urban environment and they should be asked if are interested in participating in the survey. A partner like OHSU could supplement the data collected by accessing our survey groups. If other groups use the data and add nothing else to the survey, they could argue that the survey is being done anyway so they do not need to participate in funding. However, they can pay to have additional questions included. This has to be done judiciously, however, because the more participants in a survey the more it can cost. Mike suggested that the Department of Motor Vehicles may be another source of partnership – a contact is Vince Vanderhyde in ODOT Research Group.

In response to a question, Mike noted that people using the personal GPS did not express any concerns on invasion of privacy.

## **HOUSING AND LAND NEEDS MODEL**

Richard stated that OHCS developed a model for determining housing needs and land needed for that housing to support the Oregon Land Use Planning Goal 10 - Housing. Previously, models were used to develop housing needs and these used certain assumptions. This model was developed to allow the user to look at the results based on different assumptions. Information is available for all OR communities and the Housing Needs Model can develop a preliminary housing needs report quickly. An inventory of housing is needed to factor in existing housing with projected need. The Model uses Excel spreadsheets as templates to input data relevant to a community and for graphs for displaying model results.

The Housing Needs Model can be used in conjunction with other models. It can define how much and what type of housing is needed and then determine where land will be located according to existing zoning. A community can then use transport models to look at what transportation infrastructure is needed to support the housing and population.

The Model can be run at different levels – county, city and within a city. It is very scalable as long as the population of interest is well defined. The model is available for public use at no cost. This is a useful tool being used by consultants, who are licensed and provided the model for a nominal fee.

Richard stated that the model was specifically constructed to address Oregon needs. In developing the model, it was found that housing choices are different for different communities - urban, college or resort, medium size rural or small rural communities. It is not a theoretical model but is based on actual choices made in communities. Existing information is taken from the 2000 Census for housing choice, home value, rent and demographic characteristics. Trends were identified looking at the characteristics of different choices. Age of head of household and household income was more strongly correlated with housing tenure than other variables and was selected as the primary demographic variables for the model. Household income is the key variable in determining the affordability component of housing needs.

Richard was recently notified that the American Planning Association is including the Housing Needs Model in its September-October magazine issue talking about best practices. The model used Oregon data but the concept can be applied anywhere.

Satvinder asked if the urban growth boundary makes any difference in the analysis. Richard stated this should not make a difference. It is more important whether a unit is rented or owned. The larger the community, the more of the population that rents. College and resort communities have high numbers of renters.

The model and analysis looks at 20-year scenarios and population demographics. Seven age and seven income ranges are used to create 49 age/income cohorts. The percent distribution of these cohorts is known for each community in Oregon. An economic opportunity analysis was done for Woodburn and was input to the Housing Needs Model to see the change in distribution and need for housing and land with a change in economic distribution.

The Model is based on constant dollars. There are three different scenarios for interest rates – historical average, high and low interest rates. It depends on the time frame but historical rates are generally used for long-term planning.

Another principal assumption is that affordable housing means that no more than 30 percent of income is spent on housing related costs. The seven income ranges combined with the 30 percent limit on housing costs established the price ranges and rent levels used in the model to calculate the housing units needed at each price level.

Richard noted that the model defines how much land is needed but it is up to the community to decide where to put that housing. Shinwon stated that it would be interesting to compare results of the Housing Needs Model with the transport household allocation model.

There are differences where people live whether they will be a renter or an owner. The future housing analysis also looks at underestimating the number of housing units needed because of people who choose to live in a unit less than what they can afford, thereby removing that unit from use by someone else.

More information on the Housing Needs Model is available at [http://www.ohcs.oregon.gov/OHCD/PPR\\_HousingNeedsModel.shtml](http://www.ohcs.oregon.gov/OHCD/PPR_HousingNeedsModel.shtml).

### **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING RULE UPATE**

Bob Cortright stated that update of the TPR started about a year ago. He handed out a PowerPoint presentation prepared in September 2005 summarizing the TPR review process, TPR amendments, and other evaluation issues. A series of stakeholder interviews were conducted and were shared with the OTC and the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC). A joint subcommittee considered amendments to the TPR and other recommendations.

The first phase of the update focused on Jaqua vs. City of Springfield issues, which determined that land use changes should be supported by adequate planned transportation facilities. The main issue was to define the threshold to determine at what point in a project more transportation planning needs to be done. Phase I addressed Section 060 of the TPR and this work was completed in March.

Since March, a working group assisting the subcommittee has been looking at recommendations to the TPR to address other comments from the stakeholders.

Proposed rule amendments of interest to MPOs include the following:

- MPO amendments trigger local Transportation System Plan (TSP) amendments. It allows for MPO planning horizons to extend beyond acknowledged comprehensive plans and emphasizes local coordination.

- Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is deemphasized as a principal measure of state policy and the five percent VMT reduction requirement becomes an alternative compliance standard. Local standards are allowed in place of VMT per capita requirements.
- The current 3-year deadline for downstate metro areas to complete integrated land use and transportation plans is deleted and metro areas can request extensions.
- Three more years are allowed to complete Refinement Plans required in TSPs. Small cities in metro areas are eligible for TSP exemptions.

Mike noted that all MPOs have submitted a VMT alternative measure but not all have been approved yet. Bob stated that these should not be affected by the proposed rule-making.

Bob stated that the working group is not a substitute for the public review process and additional hearings will be held on the proposed rule-making. Briefings will be held for LCDC and the OTC in September and October. Following rule notice on November 1, LCDC will hold a series of hearings before adoption in late winter.

Concern has been expressed that the proposed amendment is not consistent with the intent of the TPR, especially as it relates to changes in the policy directive to “reduce reliance on the automobile”. The proposed amendment emphasizes transportation options to achieve this policy and clarifies different expectations for metro, urban and rural areas. The OMSC members felt that proposed language is consistent with the original intent as reducing reliance on the auto is appropriately addressed through provision of alternatives and incentives.

More information on the TPR update is available on the DLCD website at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/TPR/shtml>.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

### **Freight Data Collection for the Portland Area**

Scott Drumm gave an update on the freight data collection project being conducted in the Portland area. He noted that the Ontario Ministry of Transport has been doing truck surveys in Ontario and have been successful stopping trucks and getting good data. Scott was on an expert panel on coast-to-coast freight movement, looking at establishing intercept service levels and this provided useful information.

Scott stated that gate surveys are being conducted. These are intercept surveys at major access points to the region, places where freight first touches the region at a stop point. Truck count locations have been identified and data is being collected. Clark County is included in the survey and there is good bi-state cooperation.

Some data will be available to Metro by the end of year for use in the Columbia River crossing study but the project includes 14-15 months of data collection. A final report

will be completed in about 18 months. The Port will be talking with PSU as a possible data host, in its role as a National Transportation University Center.

There are about ten data categories, including origin-destination (O-D) of shipment, type of commodities, size of truck and the route between origin-destination. Information is being collected that other businesses in the region are asking for in an attempt to maximize cooperation by truckers.

There are two reasons for the survey:

- Help update the Metro truck model. Commodity flow information is driving the model but O-D is guessed at and this project will answer O-D questions.
- There are several policy questions that currently cannot be addressed. These include questions such as what is moving across the I-5 Bridge during mid-day and what goes to the airport from Washington County at pm peak.

In response to why the project will take so long, Scott stated that seasonality was the original reason but this has dropped down the list. The main reason is that temporary staff is being hired to do the survey and equipment must be moved around the region to gather data.

Intercepts include major highways, other major intercept points and includes all trucks over 26,000 lbs. A project goal is to not impede flow of rest areas or other truck traffic. Scott noted that Oregon State University staff gave a presentation to the OMSC a year ago about using GPS to get truck data. This information was evaluated but is not able to be folded into the project.

Scott stated that the University of Washington (UW) is tracking freight movement through the state using weigh-in-motion sensors. UW has room on its server that can be used for this project and it would provide more weigh-in-motion sensors for data collection.

### **NCHRP Report**

Jerri serves on the Standing Committee for Planning for AASHTO. An NCHRP recommended projects for best practices for incorporating commodity flow into state and local planning process is being developed by UDOT.

### **TRANSIMS**

Dick stated that the TRANSIMS project is complete.

### **PORTLAND STATE UNIVERISTY-NATIONAL UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION CENTER**

Rob Bertini handout out a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the National University Transportation Center (UTC) program and the PSU Center for Transportation Studies. He stated that the vision for the UTC program is to establish recognized centers

of excellence, integrated within institutions of higher learning, that serve as a source of leaders who are prepared to meet the nation's need for safe, efficient and environmentally sound movement of people and goods.

The national designation is for PSU, in partnership with the University of Oregon, Oregon State University and the Oregon Institute of Technology. The funding for the PSU Center is the largest commitment of funds in the new federal legislation (SAFETEA-LU) - \$18 million over five years. The UTC program is part of the Research & Innovative Technology Administration (RITA) in the U.S. Department of Transportation. RITA is at the same level in the federal government as the Federal Highway Administration.

Goals for the UTC program include education, human resources, diversity, research selection, research performance and technology transfer. Research requirements are very broad. PSU will be responsible for reporting specific performance measures tied to these goals.

Previously, \$1 million was coordinated through TransNow for research, education and outreach in the Northwest region. TransNow was a collaboration of six universities in the Northwest since no single university could qualify for federal transportation research funding. University of Idaho became its own center through an earmark and University of Alaska Fairbanks, Oregon State University and PSU are now a NUTC. TransNow currently consists of the University of Washington and Washington State University because transportation research money from more than one federal source is not permitted.

PSU is looking for ways to connect the strategic plan of the PSU Transportation Center with the research plans for the state. A contract between RITA and PSU will be complete in December or January at the earliest and PSU is embarking on a strategic planning effort, a requirement of the UTC.

Many groups have been working on designation of PSU and Oregon universities as a NUTC. The OMSC and ODOT submitted letters of support for the designation, the Joint Policy Advisory Committee for Transportation (JPACT) in Portland has been very supportive, and the Oregon delegation, especially Rep. DeFazio, were instrumental in the designation. Themes for the Center will include healthy communities, land use and transportation modeling, and advanced technology.

The biggest challenge will be finding faculty. PSU has four faculty committed to the program but none are land use or transportation modelers. There is an effort to have PSU commit to two new tenured faculty, in urban studies/planning and civil engineering.

The next steps for developing the Center include:

- Mini-retreat at PSU for all faculty to discuss research themes, governance and new and substantive inter-institutional partnerships
- Faculty profiles

- Begin a strategic plan
- External Advisory Committee meeting to discuss how to represent the entire state. Question of how to shape the committee so that it is a working group that will help shape the agenda and be quality “gate keepers” to make sure that research is relevant.
- TransNow meeting

Carl asked if there is an existing pool of research projects and how will PSU solicit projects. Rob stated that five projects were previously submitted to TransNow. They were peer reviewed, include a local match, and are ready to go. The strategic plan will shape and guide the next set of research projects. TransNow rules will probably be followed in the short term. The new strategic plan will guide the UTC solicitation process for Fall 2006. Each project must have a manager and the principal investigators will be faculty members. The UTC funds are aimed at the universities so a process to coordinate between the university and agencies needs to be defined.

Richard suggested that the COSMO would be a good cooperative research project among agencies and the universities. Rob stated that the student base needs to be expanded so there are enough people to do the work. Required match can be cash or in-kind services. PSU can attract better students with better projects and there are several new PhD students who are interested in travel demand modeling.

PSU faculty met with Doug Hunt, University of Calgary and a member of the TLUMIP modeling team. Doug will be conducting a seminar at PSU on September 27 and several people will meet with him after the seminar to discuss his interest in working with PSU.

Rob noted that the UTC designation is for PSU, in partnership with the University of Oregon, Oregon State University, and the Oregon Institute of Technology. The UTC will be housed at PSU because the other universities do not have large transportation programs. One faculty member from each university will participate in the program.

Dick asked if there is an advantage of OMSC coordinating with PSU or if individual contacts would be more effective. Rob stated that there is value in the collective OMSC group and that it probably makes a difference if a consortium applies for research projects as opposed to an individual. OMSC can also help define the kind of programs that are needed, staff needs, can help identify and select appropriate faculty, and can encourage new students. Last year, several OMSC members attended meetings with faculty candidates and provided useful input into the hiring process.

Mike stated that the OMSC could look at ways to help PSU meet the performance measures requirements for RITA. It can also look for ways to leverage monies.

Rob encouraged OMSC members to start discussions about things it would like to see happen, to attend seminars, and to become engaged in identifying possible faculty members and new students. Management of the UTC program will probably look like others at PSU and could consist of a faculty member from each university, other

university representatives, and maybe a Metro representative. The strategic planning exercise will need to look at priorities and partners to maximize monies. The intent is to think of ways to work across universities and to engage agencies. Faculty education opportunities will be important and the UTC needs to think about ways to incorporate entrepreneurship.

Rob noted that there is a need for increasing education at all levels. The transportation profession is a wide continuum. It is intended that the Center will provide a one-stop shopping for continuing education. PSU maintains a broad email list-serve to notify interested people about seminars and classes and encouraged anyone who is interested but is not on the list to sign up at <http://www.cts.pdx.edu/partners.htm>. Additional information on the UTC and the PSU Transportation Center is also available at this site.

### **NEXT MEETING/AGENDA**

The next quarterly OMSC meeting will be on Wednesday, December 14, 2005, from 1:00-4:00 p.m. at the ODOT Human Resources Building in Salem. PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS IS THE 2<sup>ND</sup> WEEK IN DECEMBER TO AVOID THE HOLIDAY.

Agenda items include:

- Subcommittee Reports
  - Technical Services- Upton
  - Performance Measures - Reiff
  - Modeling Program Coordination - Jaffe
- Program Updates
  - COSMO - Upton
  - Oregon Transportation Plan Update - Bohard
- Announcements
  - 2005 Modeling Symposium Recap - Upton
- Update on major river crossing projects (Columbia River & Salem) – Walker, Jaffe
- Oregon Innovative Partnerships Program (OIPP) demonstration projects – Jim Whitty
- ODOT Research problem statements - Bohard

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

### **MEETING HANDOUTS/REFERENCES**

The following handout materials or links were provided at the OMSC meeting. For copies or more information, please contact the link provided or email Michal Wert at [mwert@teleport.com](mailto:mwert@teleport.com):

- For Modeling Symposium info and registration, see [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Modeling.shtml#4th\\_Oregon\\_Symposium](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Modeling.shtml#4th_Oregon_Symposium)
- OTP Update schedule, see [www.odot.state.or.us/tdb/planning/OTPUupdate](http://www.odot.state.or.us/tdb/planning/OTPUupdate)
- Contact Michal Wert at [mwert@teleport.com](mailto:mwert@teleport.com) for COSMO peer panel meeting summary

- Summary of Housing Needs Model, see [http://www.ohcs.oregon.gov/OHCD/PPR\\_HousingNeedsModel.shtml](http://www.ohcs.oregon.gov/OHCD/PPR_HousingNeedsModel.shtml)
- Summary of TPR update, see <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/TPR/shtml>.
- Summary of UTC and the PSU Transportation Center, see <http://www.cts.pdx.edu/partners.htm>