

Transportation Planning Guides Update

TSP Guidelines Technical Advisory Committee (TSP-TAC) Meeting #1

April 27, 2023 | 2:00 – 4:00 PM

Microsoft Teams Meeting: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Attend.	Name	Org.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Theresa Conley	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zachary Horowitz	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brian Hurley	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michael Baker	ODOT
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lisa Cornutt	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Donald Morehouse	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Glen Bolen	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mark Bernard	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Elizabeth Ledet	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Robin Wilcox	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	David Hirsch	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dominique Huffman	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill Holstrom	DLCD

Attend.	Name	Org.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Angela Rogge	DEA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lisa Scherf	City of Corvallis
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Warncke	City of Salem
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karl MacNair	City of Medford
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Auth	City of Hillsboro
<input type="checkbox"/>	Elisa Cheng	Bend Bikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emma Land	Oregon Health Authority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Susie Wright	Kittelison
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Matt Bell	Kittelison
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Molly McCormick	Kittelison
<input type="checkbox"/>	Darci Rudzinski	MIG
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CJ Dorse	MIG

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of TSP-TAC Meeting #1 was to provide an orientation to the project and review the Draft TSP Guidelines Audit and Update Strategy memorandum.

Agenda:

1. Introductions
 - a. Mike: Region 3 perspective, including supporting TSPs.
 - b. Zachary: Working on CFEC implementation with TPAU, managing the modeling aspect of the implementation.
 - c. Brian: ODOT climate office, especially interested in the interaction of long-range planning and GHG emissions.
 - d. Angela: Consultant perspective, help local agencies update their TSPs.
 - e. Mark: Region 2 planning perspective, will use these guidelines for the upcoming City of Dalles TSP update.
 - f. Glen: Region 1 planning perspective; liaison to Metro who has some unique responsibilities; support the TGM program, which has a lot of similar goals as CFEC rulemaking.
 - g. David: Region 4 traffic operations engineer perspective, need to consider what the updated TRP means for delay at intersections, modal use, and safety.

-
- h. Bill: DLCD land use and transportation planning coordinator; want the new TPR to be implementable; have been working with TSPs for a long time and the guidelines have been a useful tool for the last few years.
 - i. Karen: Long Range Planning Manager from Clackamas County.
 - j. Dominique: TPAU transportation analyst; work with TSP guidelines through helping scope and review projects, being a TAC member, and conducting development review.
 - k. Joseph: Hillsboro, use the guidelines frequently for TSP development and handling development review applications.
 - l. Julie: City of Salem and in charge of the City's TSP; haven't looked at the TSP guidelines in a while; very interested in how to actually apply the CFEC rulemaking.
 - m. Karl: Medford transportation manager; worked on the City TSP but didn't know that there were TSP guidelines at the time; looking forward to understanding how to implement the CFEC rulemaking.
 - n. Emily: Oregon health authority; don't have a day-to-day relationship with the TSP guidelines but the health impacts with the built environment is important to consider.
 - o. Elizabeth: See a lot of proposals referencing the guidelines.
 - p. Don: Region 4 planning perspective, lots of work with TSPs and development review.
 - q. Robin: Great streets program manager and looking at state-wide multimodal connections and priority corridors; don't interact much with TSP guidelines except that agencies proposing projects have used them for creating an adopted plan.
2. Equitable engagement program:
- a. If you are a Committee member participating on your own time, not compensated through your employer, please connect with Theresa about this program. ODOT will reimburse around \$20-30 per meeting for participation.
<https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Get-Involved/Pages/EECP.aspx>
3. Project Overview
- a. Project Objectives
 - i. Will work to minimize confusion and reduce variations in interpretation. DLCD is already working on some revisions.
 - b. Schedule
 - i. There will be four more TAC meetings through the end of the year.
 - ii. At the same time as this project, there are updates to other documents occurring as well:
 - 1. ODOT's Development Review Guidelines (within this same contract)
 - 2. ODOT's Analysis Procedures Manual (Kittelton is on this team as well)
 - 3. ODOT's modeling guidance documents
 - 4. GHG modeling
 - iii. Through this project, the team will note areas that may need to be handled in other documents. There should be some overlap between the documents to allow readers to understand where different resources are located.
 - iv. Comment: A lot of what we do in planning is very deliberate, with ties to OAR and statutes. Based on observation, it seems like people handling development

review complete a lot of actions based on what has been done in the past, without ties to rules. It would be helpful to have clear distinctions of where the guidelines pull from in terms of OAR and statutes.

4. Summary of TPR Changes and Impacts to TSP Guidelines

- a. See the April 20 email from Theresa for a copy of the memo.

5. Geographic Applicability

- a. Comment: Not sure how to integrate this, but can there be discussion about Metro's Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) and when cities/counties look to the RTFP versus the TPR/guidelines?

- i. It is part of Metro's current work plan to update the RTFP after the RTP is finalized. In an ideal world, the RTFP will be consistent with the TPR. For the near-term, it is likely that agencies within Metro's boundary will have to look at both. The RTFP likely will not cover all topics in the TPR. And it is likely that Metro could create requirements at a higher level for certain topics through the RTFP.

- b. Comment: Parking requirements are for jurisdictions with populations over 100,000 – when is that population measured? Medford as an example is at 90,000 and will likely go over the threshold in the horizon of the TSP.

- i. Parking reform is being guided by DLCDC staff, but believe it would be current year population.

- ii. This is a good comment for any time there is a population or other kind of threshold. Need to provide clarity of the threshold timeframe.

- c. Comment: Would like to know how to deal with jurisdictions with "honeycomb" boundaries. For different projects, which TSP covers it and how is outreach handled?

- i. City TSPs and county TSPs need to be coordinated. The discussion among the meeting participants noted that this is handled differently by different jurisdictions. Be careful of saying that a county has to adopt what a city plans, since that might not be the process in place.

- 1. There are examples of the standards in a city not matching the county vision. Such as a 3-lane designation by the city but 5-lane in the county TSP.

- 2. DLCDC comment: This came up a lot during the CFEC rulemaking development. We try to allow flexibility in the rule about how this is handled. But it needs to be clear who is making the decisions. There are a lot of different IGAs in the state, some are very old. Want the IGAs to be clear and for agencies to work together on those.

- ii. For outreach, TPR sections -0120 to -0135 provide some direction about public engagement.

- d. Comment: Within the guidance, could acknowledge the difficulty of big jurisdictions that plan for both urban and rural and how is that handled. How to handle counties that are partially in MPO: do you need to split the TSP into an urban TSP and a rural TSP? What are the legal requirements related to this? Recognizing that everyone handles

implementation differently. Are these rules if you are within an MPO but outside the UGB?

- i. DLCDC comment: In Division 12, drew the line at UGB. Therefore, outside the UGB are rural and would not use the new rules. Division 44 is within MPO boundary (MPA boundary for Metro).
 - e. Comment: See that a lot of the rulemaking is focused within CFAs and prioritizes multimodal connections. But would argue that agencies also need to think about intercity connections. Don't want the focus on the CFA transit to remove the focus on intercity transit as well. Another consideration is the tie between transit priorities and impacts to parking.
 - i. TriMet did some studies recently about impact of service enhancement. When they focus on ridership in the local areas, they found that they have bigger impacts. There is a balance to try to think about coverage versus productivity.
 - ii. For transit planning within TSPs, how do they reference TDPs and the statewide planning? This might be outside CFEC rulemaking but could be noted.
 - iii. Want to have enough guidance on how to incorporate transit planning and the prioritization of transit in TSPs. The service planning is normally done more by the provider, which often is not the agency creating a TSP.
6. TSP Guidelines Update Strategy
 - a. Comment: For question about structure, think it would be smart to have all users be able to see what they could do even if they are not in an MPO. Could benefit from seeing what others are doing.
 - b. Does anyone have an example of a statement of work to include as the updated TPR is included in the process?
 - c. Comment: What are your deliverables? How much instruction manuals versus discussing why? Such as for engagement around parking reform, will there be fact sheets or something to help demonstrate the why's? There is the possibility to explain the benefits. Network permeability and other topics could be useful too.
 - i. There will be training materials at the end, so maybe that is where this idea comes in.
 - d. Comment: Is there a group that has approval at the end of this project to make sure there is agreement with ODOT and DLCDC? Also, is there a feedback loop if there is a part of the rules that is very difficult to implement? And if some of the boxes can't be checked, what does it mean to have a non-compliant TSP?
 - i. DLCDC has been directed to make sure this is implementable. The first opportunity to make tweaks is coming this summer.
 - e. Comment: Does the TSP guidelines go into what detail level a TSP should get into versus what warrants a refinement plan? The CFEC rule does not specify what could be done in the TSP versus in a refinement plan. Will the guidelines say what is an A+ TSP versus just a C, given limited resources?

-
- i. The shall/should/could structure helps, but even in the shalls, there are different ways to do something and different levels of resources needed to meet those requirements.
 - ii. Seems like an area where can coordinate with Zachary's APM update project to dig into that more.
 - iii. Will likely keep seeing a range in how people meet the requirements based on resources, funding sources, etc. Even in the shalls, want to fully define but then have the range of how you can meet it.
 - iv. A main focus of the updated TPR is on GHG reduction. So getting to the modeling and incorporating CFAs is one way to help get to a "good enough" TSP. And the development of performance standards is also really important. A toolbox with a range of options is likely part of what we create for the APM project.
 - 1. Comment: There is a specific way to prioritize projects. The projects will then tell you what the VMT reduction is. Seems like there will be a lot of iterations between the projects and modeling to make sure the reduction target is met. Seems like an important thing to coordinate between the two projects. Potential iterations create potential timing impacts that could affect short timelines and small budgets.
 - a. There is potential for this process to be iterative. There is potential that the growth may be reallocated a bit based on CFAs. The land use reallocation and the CFAs allowing for non-auto trips or shorter trips. So CFAs can help carry a lot of the change and then be supported by the focus on ped/bike/transit
 - b. One of the benefits of moving away from v/c is that can evaluate intersections/roadway segments in other ways for safety and other goals.
 - f. Comment: Going back to training materials, it will be important to know how to engage transit providers and keep them involved.
 - g. Comment: CFEC rulemaking does not really address equity and safety so far. Is climate the first priority? How will that shake out? We could do a lot of things that make lives better but don't necessarily cut emissions.
 - i. DCLD comment: With equity, want to make sure voices are included and centered in the work. We have climate targets we are trying to meet, but need to bring everyone along to make those decisions.
 - ii. Know from our own safety work, that people of color are most impacted.
 - iii. The section -0830 analysis for vehicle capacity expansion processes does exempt some types of projects – active transportation and safety projects for example – from the analysis.
 - h. Comment: Liked the materials that were put together for this meeting. It would be helpful to know which sections are impacting which bundles. Could the meetings also

incorporate an update from Zachary's group? Can there be a list of all the meetings and outcomes needed?

- i. This group will meet approximately every other month. Would you prefer all four appointments now or meeting by meeting?
 - ii. The majority of the attendees liked the option of sending a doodle about 6-8 weeks out for scheduling each meeting.
 - i. Comment: Would like considerations for when a county has a regional TSP that has projects that are not owned/managed by the county, but then have our own TSP list on County roads. Not sure the guidelines talk about the difference of the regional TSP versus a local TSP.
 - j. Comment: Another consideration is about transit projects and impacts on VMT, and there may be projects that are outside the jurisdiction that will impact the VMT. The regional versus local may not be something that can be directed since different jurisdictions do it differently.
 - k. Comment: Will the toolbox be part of the first bundle?
 - i. The APM work will have a toolbox. And these projects are running in parallel. Don't anticipate too many deliverables from the parallel projects prior to the first bundle.
7. Next Steps
- a. Provide additional feedback to Theresa by May 4th
 - b. Next meeting in mid to late June