



MEETING SUMMARY

TPR MODELING AND ANALYSIS GUIDES UPDATE

OMSC WORKING GROUP MEETING #1

MAY 30, 2023; 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

1. PROJECT TEAM INTRODUCTIONS/ AGENDA OVERVIEW

1:00

- Project team introductions
 - Kayla Fleskes-Lane, DKS Associates
 - Garth Appanaitis, DKS Associates
 - Tara Weidner, ODOT Climate Office
 - Jeff Frkonja, RSG
 - Ray Jackson, SKATS,
 - Nick Meltzer, Cascades West COG
 - Aaron Breakstone, Metro
 - Becky Knudson, ODOT
 - Alex Bettinardi, ODOT
 - Kelly Clark, Central Lane MPO
 - Kim Sapunar SKATS,
 - Zachary Horowitz, ODOT
 - Yazeed, RVCOG

2. PROJECT OVERVIEW, GOALS AND SCHEDULE

- Zachary Horowitz (ODOT) summarized project goals and outcomes. He highlighted key phases of the project, the timeline for the project, and related CFEC projects.

3. RELATED CFEC PROJECTS AND TECH MEMO #3 DISCUSSION

- Garth Appanaitis, DKS Associates, provided an overview of Tech Memo #3, highlighting the interface between this project and the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) Update, Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) update and Transportation System Plan (TSP) Guidelines update.
 - Jeff Frkonja, RSG - What is the timeline for the TSP Guidelines Update? Zachary noted that there will be three primary bundles of information in addition to development review guidelines, all of which will be expected to be completed by early 2024.
- Becky Knudson, ODOT - OHP update doesn't have a scope of work yet.
- Nick Meltzer, Cascades West COG – OHP performance measure is currently focused around the v/c ratio. There is a tradeoff between state and local accessibility when having TSP, area plan and project level discussions. This will be a key need for coordination moving forward.
 - Garth - OHP identifies facility classifications and v/c standards. This project will help develop a toolbox of performance measures and standards which could be applied by local agencies.

- Zachary - V/C ratios are performance standards that are derived from models. What other performances standards can be based in analysis versus which do not need to be? This project will want to provide guidance where consistency across projects and jurisdiction needs to be maintained.
- Nick – How does the ODOT Blueprint for Urban Design (BUD) work with or conflict with OHP? For example, OHP designates freight routes with lower v/c standards but that can result in larger intersections for people walking and biking to navigate, which might be counter to the BUD. What do we do in the interim before OHP is updated but while we need to integrate Climate-Friendly Areas (CFAs) now?
- Tara Weidner, ODOT - OTP will be going to the Oregon Transportation Commission this summer for adoption. A lot of policy language in Statewide Transportation Strategy (STS) are leading drivers of prioritizing policies and are integrated into OTP. Discussion around targets is still coming. Safety, Climate and Equity seem to be leading policies.
- Jeff – What applications are TSPs going to be required to do? TSP coordination will be critical (target setting, model specifications, model guidance).
- Tara – Performance measures will come out of OTP and we will want them to be things that can come out of models where possible.
- Alex Bettinardi, ODOT – Need to figure out processes for current travel demand model tools and processes for developing models. Need to work within current OHP but also anticipate future needs.
 - Kelly Clark, Central Lane MPO – Need to work within existing data, agency staffing and expertise limitations for modeling guidance while looking ahead to the next generation of models.
 - > Garth – Case studies will include traditional trip-based models and activity-based models (ABM) to try to highlight both types.
 - Kelly – What is the data that is needed on the network side of things? We have good tracking for roadway but not necessarily for sidewalks. How does this interact with models?
 - > Garth – This project will identify example performance measures for the eight performance areas and touch on data needs. Data needs will also be captured with multimodal inventory project.
 - > Kelly – What is the scope of the multimodal inventory project?
 - Garth - Focus of multimodal inventory extends beyond state facilities. Within CFAs there are additional inventory needs. Data collection would set up local agencies for TSP updates.

4. OAR REVIEW (TECH MEMO #1) DISCUSSION

- Garth provided an overview of Tech Memo #1. He discussed some of the key areas that were flagged as potential rules changes that may influence analysis/procedures.
- Alex – Team has done early testing around CFAs in Albany. Does not seem like implementing CFAs will require significant changes or the tools or how they are used, we will just want to improve guidance for how to use the tools for specific use cases (like CFAs). To model CFAs, need to consider modifying almost all model inputs (housing, employment, transit, parking fares, travel cost, etc.). It is not just about modeling where houses are located but also what

other reactions are needed to get the response we need from an emissions and equity standpoint. Need to consider entire model area, not just CFAs.

- Garth – Heard similar comments from Martin Mann at APM User Group (APMUG) meeting.
- Nick – How does public transportation system planning in travel demand models connect with transit agency planning work? CALM travel demand model covers cities of different sizes, how do requirements change for different sized cities?
 - Garth – There is a population threshold for Climate-Friendly Equitable Community (CFEC) requirements.
 - Becky – Building on what Nick shared, transit agencies may have different objectives when developing routes that may not optimize meeting CFEC goals.
- Kim – CFAs could be fairly small geographically, perhaps a subarea within a TAZ, which could result in the need to modify the zone structure.
 - Alex – Agree, a lot of CFAs could be a sub-TAZ level.
 - Tara – Small CFAs will not provide the same climate benefits as larger CFAs, so there may be a limit to how small CFAs can be.
- Alex – CFEC policies all need to be modeled, not just housing and employment.
- Zachary – Need to still build in a certain amount of flexibility to account for different agencies and models. Will need to understand how certain elements (transportation demand management [TDM] measures, equity) may impact vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) to prioritize the timing for updates to make to models and modeling guidance.
 - Zachary – One additional comment about transit agency work: because transit has a relatively large potential to reduce VMT and single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips, it is one of the more important elements that we will need to focus on in terms of figuring out the best and most consistent way to model, especially in cases where local jurisdictions (cities/counties) adopt aggressive transit plans.
 - > Nick – It's also seeing the most change right now due to the influx of Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund monies.
 - > Zachary – Yes, absolutely. There is a lot of overlap with equity needs too.
- Ray Jackson, SKATS – SKATS is doing scenario planning over the next year and half then will update TSP. How will scenario planning be coordinated with modeling efforts? How can we coordinate between different model types (VisionEval vs. traditional travel demand model vs. ABM vs. MOVES vs. transit modeling software)? How will models maintain control totals from PSU and maintain the financially constrained network?
 - Tara – Agree, this will need to be figured out. Will want to try to maintain consistency between models as much as possible.
 - Ray – With scenario planning, what level of detail are we reporting with VisionEval versus travel demand models? What level are we trying to calibrate the models? This will be important as we transition between model types (VisionEval, four-step model then ABM).
 - > Tara – Nothing in the rules are in absolute values. All metrics are based per capita and is based on percent change between base and future year, so the various models can have different absolute values. VisionEval can do greenhouse gas emissions directly so don't have to rely on VMT.

- Becky - MPOs are likely to slowly move toward CFA development/CFEC goals in small increments as land can be redeveloped. This process will need to recognize that and be able to accommodate different MPO approaches to meeting objectives in different ways over time.
- Nick – How to appropriately model bike infrastructure?
- Jeff – Equity seems like it should be a priority.
 - Tara – Should this be under ABM guidance?
 - Zachary – Can develop guidance, this was heard as a desire from APMUG.
 - Ray – Should equity analysis focus primarily on existing conditions and not necessarily future year? PSU population forecasts do not project specific disadvantaged populations. Also, how does TPR define disadvantaged populations and how does this align with other local agency/federal definitions?
 - Nick – How can model outputs help address all of the various equity definitions?
 - Becky - If MPOs are expected to identify detailed equity demographics, they will have to also identify how they plan to meet those forecasts, (e.g., locate lower income households in CFAs with smaller living spaces and potentially higher rents).
 - > Zachary - Note that the equity rules apply to City and County jurisdictions, not MPOs. However, there is a question as to how/when to incorporate equity work in travel demand models. Not sure to what extent that can be done at this time.
 - Tara - Some more on equitable outcomes with links to a summary of equity crosswalk of the rules: <https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Documents/CFECEquitableOutcomesStatement.pdf>

5. REVIEW OF GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS (TECH MEMO #2) DISCUSSION

- Garth provided an overview of Tech Memo #2, highlighting the three documents that were reviewed: APM, Modeling and Analysis Guidelines and Modeling Procedures Manual for Land Use Changes (MPMLUC).
- Ray – Who has reviewed the MAG/MPMLUC and uses them? The guidance should be covered in the document that gets the most exposure. Maybe this is the MPMLUC chance for increased exposure. How much are these documents used outside ODOT?
- Alex – Do not feel strongly about where the content lives as long as the content makes sense.
- Kelly – Not very familiar with MAG or MPMLUC documents. Seems like there are a ton of new changes involved with this project and all the other CFEC related projects. Might be helpful to have an indicator in the guidance document if something is tied to CFEC, to help sort out new changes.
- Becky - Models will be tools in our toolbox. Some of this work will have to rely on analytical methods that utilize model-produced information.
 - Zachary - DLCDC created a process for equity analysis for the CFAs and that is in the new rules. Equity work may overlap at a later stage in the TSP process (not travel demand modeling)--but the question about how all the different methods/approaches to do equity analysis still stand (i.e., ODOT chooses multimodal improvements on their system using their social equity map as one metric).
 - Zachary - I think the focus on the equity pieces falls more on the TSP Guidelines work (Theresa Conley's project) and in the development of analytical methods that will land in the

APM. For several reasons (data availability, for example), there may not be as much overlap with the modeling work.

- Zachary – Would rather complete guidance for this project and insert into MPMLUC later rather than the other way around.
 - Tara – Should focus on what would this community of users (OMSC) wants (e.g., standalone CFEC document?) The procedures will be more than just land use. This committee can help provide a recommendation.
- Ray – Everything before us is past, this is reality for future. All these guidance documents should be rethought. Moving forward, these documents should help local agencies and their consultants get the modeling right for new CFEC rules.
- Zachary – This initial work sets the stage for type of analysis that will be updated through this project.

6. NEXT STEPS / ADJOURN

- Garth reviewed next steps for the project. He noted that the next tech memo will include a review of the models and documentation.
- Zachary – Would you be able to output household-based VMT in your current models?
 - Ray – Maybe.
 - Alex – Most models could probably do some representation to get as close as possible but there would be some missing pieces. One key missing piece would be to include procedure for what is outside of model boundary.
 - Ray – What boundaries would need to be used? MPO, UGB, City?
 - Tara – VMT for any residents that live within the boundary, regardless of where they go. How do we consistently treat non-home-based trips?
 - Garth – Another thing that could be covered within Tech Memo #4 could be Statewide Integrated Model (SWIM) or other tools.
- Zachary – Garth and team will send out doodle poll for next OMSC working group once Tech Memo #4 is ready to share.