



MEETING SUMMARY

TPR MODELING AND ANALYSIS GUIDES UPDATE

TAC MEETING #2

SEPTEMBER 28, 2023; 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

1. PROJECT TEAM INTRODUCTIONS / AGENDA OVERVIEW

10:00

- Project team introductions
 - Garth Appanaitis, DKS Associates
 - Zachary Horowitz, ODOT
 - Susan Wright, Kittelson & Associates
 - Molly McCormick, Kittelson & Associates
 - Other attendees included: Aaron Brooks, Alex Bettinardi, Christi McDaniel-Wilson, Cody Meyer, Jeff Frkonja, Jennifer Danziger, Jess Zdeb, Miranda Wells, Neelam Dorman, Peter Schuytema, Rob Inerfeld, Steve Kelly, Tara Weidner, Theresa Conley.
- Review agenda and meeting purpose

2. CONTEXT OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES/STANDARDS/TARGETS IN OAR

9:05

- Zachary Horowitz (ODOT) provided a contextual overview of terminology for today's meeting and where it is referenced in the OARs.

3. OVERVIEW OF TM#8 AND PRIOR WORK

9:15

- Molly McCormick (KAI) provided an overview of TM#8, which summarized prior work that was conducted on past projects.
- Cody Meyer (DLCD) inquired about how the recommendations from the OHP White paper stack up to the OAR and the OTP Update.
 - Susie Wright noted that most of the recommendations would be implemented through the OHP Update, which hasn't occurred yet.
- Jeff Frkonja asked for an example of a near term and a longer-term measure.
 - Molly McCormick noted that one example could be looking at the condition of priority state facilities now and looking at all statewide facilities in the future (where that is not yet data for some of these facilities).

- Christi McDaniel-Wilson noted that under the key findings for TM8 the last bullet gets at Federal PMs and reporting but might add to this bullet to include the penalty's ODOT incurs when we fail to meet federal PM's.

4. OVERVIEW OF TM#9 AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES TOOLBOX

9:40

- Susan Wright (KAI) provided an overview of TM9, which included 35 candidate measures to be screened and identified direct and secondary objectives that would be aligned with each measure. An evaluation process has been identified but has not been conducted to determine which measures would be included with additional guidance in TM10.
- Jess Zdeb - Regarding data needs, will the state be helping local agencies with data collection?
 - Susan Wright- There are system level measures; these are more locally focused. They are more applicable at the facility level. The TPR does require a lot of new data collection. ODOT would not necessarily support all the new data collection that might be needed for a measure that a local agency selects.
 - Theresa Conley - Hoping to kick-off the multimodal inventory this fall and start having data roll out in 2024. The inventory sections of the rules, -0505, -0605, etc., gives a good idea to what will be collected. This will be a big lift so hopefully it goes well!
- Rob Inerfeld - Is there a good primer on what would be affected by the performance standards? Land use review, street design?
 - Susan Wright - The TPR identifies that local agencies need to adopt two standards. How those are applied may have nuances based on local agency code. Some may be operationally focused. These would apply to development review.
 - > Rob Inerfeld - the building permit level is what would be most impactful if we really want to move the needle.
 - > Cody Meyer - The fiscally constrained project list in the TSP does need to show a VMT reduction. Maybe a revision to the memo would be to clarify the use cases.
 - GHG measures for 5-year monitoring
 - This content is more focused on performance standards -0060 (TSP projects, Plan amendments). Helpful to know if some of these satisfy both. There is also a local government discretion for development review.
- Alex Bettinardi - How do the 8 performance objectives nest to the 6 OTP areas? It would be good to have a "crosswalk diagram" that shows this?
- Neelam Dorman - The Regional Mobility Policy (RMP) will eventually go into the RTP. Would this cover the local jurisdictions or would they have to adopt local standards?
 - Susan Wright - The Regional Transportation Functional Plan (RTFP) would provide some guidance for local jurisdictions, but ultimately will still be up to the local jurisdictions to select their standards. There will be a requirement to look at RTP measures, but this does not drive the local standards.
 - Zachary Horowitz - Good question and lot of advantage for Metro area jurisdictions to adopt one of the Metro measures as a standard. Could encourage local jurisdictions to apply these at the local TSP as well.
- Christi McDaniel-Wilson - Looking at a few of the standards - the predictive ped and bike crashes is pretty intensive. Is the intention that this would apply for the entire system?

- Susan Wright - these have not been evaluated yet, but this is one that could apply better to the development level than a system. Or there may be a way to apply it that could be used.
- Christi McDaniel-Wilson - could get conflicting results between risk and prediction since for predictive ped/bike we don't have calibrated SPFs to support this approach.
- Jess Zdeb - Some of these measures are related to specific modes, but some measures don't specify a mode, so not sure what the modal intention is. Where there is not a mode specified, is there an intent for what users of the system are covered?
 - Susan Wright - Some comments from the APMUG that some of the evaluation criteria may be better as pass/fail application.
 - Zachary Horowitz – It is possible to adopt several different standards that apply to different modes. However, it would also be an option to adopt a standard that applies to multiple modes. Traditionally, the v/c ratio has really only been applied to the auto mode. Safety related standards have the potential to relate to all modes.
 - Jess Zdeb – Likes using the screening question of “can this apply to all modes?” as an additional criteria
 - > Zachary Horowitz – Agrees, though the criteria may not be needed for all adopted standards. However, it provides additional value to one or more standards that could be applied to all modes.
- Steve Kelley - Are methods transferable between jurisdictions? Is the data and methods available. Can these be built into a reporting cycle?
 - Kevin Young - Goal of the climate friendly areas is aspirational. Over time hoping to get 30% of households in the CFA. Not based on market analysis or forecasting current trends. Some legal reasons for this. Trying to accomplish a paradigm shift. Trying to get more people to live there.
 - Steve Kelley - Important to document assumptions and when those assumptions are considered. The off-model tool may have some additional inputs that are similar. How to we avoid double counting the
 - Tara Weidner - thinks the PlaceType tool is good. Tightening up the definitions. There are a number of ingredients and trying to better understand what is needed to move the needle. PlaceTypes is not really a market tool, but it helps to understand what would happen if certain thresholds are met. If we look at what the travel models are showing and what additional assumptions need to be made.
 - Jeff - These tools will continue to evolve.
- Rob Inerfeld - Skeptical that V/C or LOS will lead to improvements to GHG.
 - Tara Weidner – Noted that the STS roadmap to transport GHG reductions covers ITS and pricing policies that focus on reliability and minimize induced demand.

5. OVERVIEW OF MODEL REVIEW AND OMSC ENGAGEMENT

10:35

- Garth Appanaitis (DKS) provided a high-level overview of TM4 (Model Review) Findings and the engagement process with the OMSC Working Group feeding into the TM5 Modeling Framework.

6. NEXT STEPS / ADJOURN

10:55

- Please provide comments by 10/10