



MEETING SUMMARY

TPR MODELING AND ANALYSIS GUIDES UPDATE

TAC MEETING #1

MAY 31, 2023; 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

1. INTRODUCTIONS / AGENDA OVERVIEW

- Introductions included in opportunity for participants to state what they were most excited about or concerns to address through TAC participation.
 - Garth Appanaitis, DKS Associates
 - > Holistic perspective to support jurisdictions.
 - Kayla Fleskes-Lane, DKS Associates
 - Zachary Horowitz, ODOT
 - Jennifer Danziger, Lancaster-Mobley
 - > Has mostly done development work recently and how it impacts land use applications and zone changes.
 - Miranda Wells, ODOT Region 4
 - > Experience has mostly been with development work, modeling and planning.
 - Christi McDaniel-Wilson, ODOT State Traffic Safety Engineer
 - > Would like to understand the overlap with ARTS program.
 - Aaron Brooks, ODOT Region 3
 - > Hoping to learn more including about development review and zone change process.
 - Theresa Conley, ODOT
 - Cody Meyer, DLCD
 - > Excited to see this work getting off the ground
 - Savannah Crawford, ODOT
 - > Has been hearing some concerns about how to implement.
 - Steve Adams, City of Milwaukie
 - > His city has a strong commitment to sustainability
 - Steve Kelley, Washington County
 - > Working on updating code and ordinances at the County.
 - Rob Inerfield, City of Eugene
 - > Served on the RAC and would like to see how this can make our work easier and better, including feedback and monitoring.
 - Kelly Clark, Central Lane MPO
 - > Excited to dig in

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.

- Miranda – What is the schedule and expectations for TAC review? Garth – Project team can share a high-level schedule.

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. He provided a high-level summary of what the project team heard from the Oregon Modeling Steering Committee (OMSC) meeting and Analysis and Procedures Manual (APM) User Group meeting.
- Rob Inerfield, City of Eugene – TSP Guidelines sounds less formal than requirement or rules. Should this be renamed to requirement or rules?
 - Theresa – This is an update of existing TSP guidelines and provides best practice examples and updates to make guidelines consistent with the latest Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) rules. They are not rules themselves.
- Miranda Wells, ODOT – Will this project include traffic analysis recommendations/guidance for TPR [-0060] analysis?
 - Theresa Conley, ODOT – That is the intent. TSP guidelines would also coordinate with this project.
 - > Miranda – Specifically, this is related to UGB expansions, land use decisions and required betterments. Typically look at v/c but how can we make decisions that are including climate performance as a betterment of the system.
 - Cody Meyer, DLCD – Terminology – TPR is used as shorthand for -0060 analysis. There might be a need for a glossary for typical language.
 - > Miranda – Not just developers but also triggered by communities with UGB expansion.
 - > Zachary - To Cody's comment about terminology: We are always working on and updating the project FAQ, which includes some additional information on some of the terminology. https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Planning/Documents/CFEC_FAQs.pdf
 - Theresa – The TSP / Development Review Guidelines updates includes contingency task to provide minor updates or a memo to inform updates to related documents that could be refreshed related to CFEC. For example, the transit development plan guidebook, highway design manual / Blueprint for Urban Design (BUD) implementation. Perhaps Miranda's comment on traffic analysis guidance can fit in with this contingency work.
 - Steve Kelley, Washington County – What is the process for making findings for different scales of plan updates with new CFEC rules? There is a lot of interplay between the different sections and the process flow is challenging to follow.

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.
- Christi McDaniel-Wilson, ODOT - Are the Climate-Friendly Areas (CFAs) the same as PlaceTypes?
 - Cody – No, same in concept though.

- Cody – How do we do a zone change where half or the zone is within CFA/Regional Town Center and half of the zone is without?
- Jennifer Danzinger, Lancaster-Mobley – Seems like there are a lot of hoops for a land use change. What are appropriate thresholds (size of land use change) for when to go through all the measures?
 - Garth – Part of this understanding will come through with development review guidelines project. The appropriate size of lift and data needs for analysis will need to be considered.
 - Zachary – SB 743 in California has been around for 10 years and to a certain extent, their various procedures/guidance are still being worked on and revised.
- Zachary – Will eventually need to prioritize some of these analysis needs and also determine what the appropriate level of analysis that would need to be incorporated into travel demand models or through other forms of analysis.
- Steve K. – Felt a lot of the things that were flagged “maybe” were closer to “yes” and items flagged “no” closer to “maybe”. Mostly concern with Section 210 and Section 215. Creating something like vehicle miles traveled (VMT) calculators that are used in California will be key to success.
- Zachary – There is a desire to meet intent of rules with implementation in a way that isn’t an arduous burden on local jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions may be focused on developing active transportation inventory and developing transit improvements to better support VMT reduction.
- Kelly Clark, Central Lane MPO – Regarding performance measures, there are a lot of different things that will be required to track, monitor and analyze. Will want to understand which ones are required, how to create consistency in how they are measured and efficiencies in the analysis.
 - Cody – Need to be consistent with terminology. Performance measures for monitoring and reporting is slightly different than metrics to measure transportation impacts from a land use change. There are performance standards and performance measures.
 - Zachary – Performance measures in -0905 might require similar tools as performance standards.
 - Kelly – How are reporting cycles and data going to be aligned and consistent?
- Steve K. – A lot of other sections reference performance measures in Section 900. How can these be applied when considering the other sections? Some guidance on developing connections would be really useful.
- Zachary – What should be prioritized?
 - Kelly – Everything.
 - Steve K. – What are the anticipated greenhouse gas reduction benefits from implementing these rules? How do we quantify the benefits? Seems like starting with VMT is important. Need to talk about it in relative/comparative terms to ensure changes to methodology won’t show changes to results. Need to articulate quantitatively what the impacts of rules are to the communities.
 - > Kelly – I agree. What is the low-hanging fruit?
 - Christi - Under the Prioritization Framework (660-012-0155)- Cities, counties, Metro, and state agencies shall consider prioritization factors as provided in section (3)- does this require consideration of ALL or some?

- > Theresa - The TSP Guidelines will coordinate with this project to provide some guidance on this. Section -155 of the TPR does say a community 'shall' consider many of the factors alongside 'other factors determined in the community'. However, similar to current TSP processes there are a variety of ways that a community can weight those factors to best reflect community priorities.
- o Steve Adams, City of Milwaukie – Milwaukie will be moving forward with their TSP update. What will be required? City wants to make sure the new TSP has a long shelf life.
 - > Theresa – All rules apply right now. A few may be updated (such as Rule -0215). CFEC staff can support ODOT region planning and City staff to learn together how to establish a CFEC-compliant TSP.
- o Jennifer – Performance thresholds in new rules require at least two performance standards. Understanding changes to performance standards should be a higher priority since it is constantly applied on transportation projects.
 - > Garth – Project will be developing toolbox for performance standards. Will consider data availability and difficulty as part of the toolbox development.

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 Application Guide (MAG) and Modeling Procedures Manual for Land Use Changes (MPMLUC).
- Steve – If a toolbox around the eight areas of performance standards is created, there should be some sort of users guide for that toolbox.
 - o Zachary – This will also be considered for CFAs.

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.