

## Transportation Planning Guides Update

### TSP Guidelines Technical Advisory Committee (TSP-TAC) Meeting #2

June 26, 2023 | 9:00 – 11:00 AM

Attend.	Name	Org.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Theresa Conley	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zachary Horowitz	ODOT
<input type="checkbox"/>	Brian Hurley	ODOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michael Baker	ODOT
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lisa Cornutt	ODOT
<input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Elisa Cheng	Bend Bikes
<input type="checkbox"/>	Emma Land	Oregon Health Authority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Susie Wright	Kittelison
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Matt Bell	Kittelison
<input type="checkbox"/>	Molly McCormick	Kittelison
<input type="checkbox"/>	Darci Rudzinski	MIG
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CJ Doxsee	MIG
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Erik having	ODOT

**Meeting Purpose:** The purpose of TSP-TAC Meeting #2 is to review the Draft Bundle 1 of TSP Guidelines edits.

**Agenda:**

1. Project Overview and Status Update (15 min)
  - a. Background
  - b. Project Objectives
  - c. Schedule
2. Overview of TSP Guidelines Update Strategy (10 min)
3. Summary of Bundle 1 Edits (60 min)
  - a. Are the edits and structure clear and implementable?
  - b. Do you have a different interpretation of the TPR changes and how they impact the TSP Guidelines?
  - c. Did the team miss any items to adjust in these sections?
4. General Discussion (25 min)
5. Next Steps (10 min)

**Notes:**

Introductory sections

Comment: What would trigger a full update vs minor revision (for example, a UGB expansion)?

Comment: Can you explain the removal of RTP references?

---

Susie Response: TPR can't direct MPOs so it's correcting that issue.

Comment: Consider adding a callout box describing how RTPs and TSPs influence each other and add RTP linkage into Step 3 for the Plan Review

Comment: 830 2b specifies a full update when a 3-lane facility is added

Response: This may be changed in the new rulemaking

Comment: Distinguish major vs minor updates in the When to Update a TSP section

Comment: Are agencies still doing periodic review?

DLCD Response: Yes, but rarely. It's still an option for local governments.

### **Coordination**

Comment: Do you include transit and travel options providers in agency coordination? Yes

Comment: 830 projects – who owns them and how do we coordinate on them? ODOT projects may need local agency projects to mitigate.

Comment: Underserved populations in 0125 – what are the expectations for engagement? Entire list? We don't typically engage all the way down to identifying single parents for example

ODOT Response: Building relationships is a process – in engagement plan makes progress in all areas and there's a good faith effort to reach all populations then that should be acceptable. This is probably a list to strive for rather than a "shall" list.

DLCD Response: Don't expect agencies to reach each individual group but move in the right direction.

Comment: Add in discussions with engineers/practitioners who use the TSP on a daily basis, not just planners developing the TSP so it's more likely to be implemented.

Comment: Is there a role for the state in the two equity approaches and definition of populations?

Response: Who does should be addressed in the scoping phase. Need to discuss level of effort and if they need assistance.

Comment: Is there a desire for consistency with ODOT's social equity index? It's being phased out but it is still useful to locals. The state could support locals with consistent reporting on equitable engagement.

DLCD Response: The rule applies to local governments but the state develops tools to help. The state also has its own requirements. Need follow up internal discussions on ODOT tools that are available.

Comment: Important to note and be open to the fact that we will learn new things through the first updates. Need to reinforce success working with NGOs. It's new costs but very valuable in the long run.

Comment: 830 refers to public involvement. Can you make references to 830 in the public involvement section so it's captured here and not in a different section?

## Step 2 – Goals and Objectives

Comment: Will guidance address how to do the prioritization? Would like guidance and best practices.

Comment: Is there a project by project expectation of GHG reduction?

Response: No – want to see balanced set of projects that results in reduced GHG

Comment: Need to learn how to operationalize Step 5. Need guidance on how to deal with conflicting goals and measures. With discretionary immunity, need to fix the most dangerous places first. We use SPIS rankings to do this. How do we prioritize with the new rules without losing discretionary immunity?

Comment: Order of bullets – put CFAs up first, then underserved populations, then bikes/peds, then move what's first to last.

Comment: Reducing SOV travel – would be helpful to have a model that forecasts mode split and impact of projects on mode split.

Comment: Active Transportation – LTS 1 or 2 vs all ages and abilities. These are in conflict as LTS 2 is not all ages and abilities.

Comment: Clarify this section is about supporting climate scenario planning – needs some modifications to be more understandable.

Comment: page 11 – 215 requires TSPs to clearly establish how to deal with tradeoffs.

Comment: Are “safe” and “bike/ped friendly” defined? Nuanced by classification and roadway characteristics. If we do define it, where do we put it? TSP Guidance, APM? Varies by community (crossing distances for example)

DLCD Comment: Performance Standards in 215 are intended to replace LOS and v/c with a different facility by facility standard. Performance measures are systemwide and demonstrate how we are doing at the system level.

Comment: Performance standards are used for 060 and applies to all MPOs, not just Metro – need to clarify the intent was to apply to all cities and counties in all MPOs but also applies to Metro as it's a unique MPO with land use authority.

## Step 3 – Plans and Policy Review

Comment: Plans to consider – BUD is a process, not a standard. Standards apply to dev. Rev. State that in TSPs there should be a BUD land use context establishment and cross-section.

Comment: Need to add RTP guidance from MPOs.

---

Comment: TSAP may have a Vulnerable Road User Index.

Comment: Clarify that CFA = 2040 Centers

### Meeting Chat:

A transcript of the Teams Meeting chat is included below with comments identified in **bold** text that may have specific edits to the Bundle 1 content.

[9:56 AM] Julie Warncke

I am also not tracking with where you are in pdfs  
like 2

[10:00 AM] Elisa Cheng

I agree with Julie, I'm find it hard to track this

[10:16 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

What pages of the PDF are we looking at?

[10:17 AM] WILCOX Robin A

10, right?

[10:17 AM] Susan Wright

10-13

like 1

[10:17 AM] CJ Doxsee

PDF p. 10

[10:17 AM] BOLEN Glen A

10

[10:20 AM] Joseph Auth

I need more time reading 4B-2-4 before I can comment on this section.

[10:27 AM] BOLEN Glen A

The transportation system plan must clearly establish how to apply the multiple performance standards to a proposal that meets some, but not all, of the transportation performance standards.

[10:27 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

Page 14 of the PDF discusses Performance Standards - does that get to it?

like 1

[10:36 AM] BERNARD Mark

The mobility targets referenced in 660-012-0060 must be met to make findings of consistency with Goal 12.

[10:38 AM] Julie Warncke

For future agenda packets, it would be good to have consistent page numbers. I printed out the pdfs and the page numbering is different than what people are referring to as pdf page numbers.

like 1

[10:47 AM] WILCOX Robin A

Does it matter that "The BUD" is now just part of the HDM?... no longer a "bridging document" - it looks like that's what the edit in this document cleaned up

like 1

[10:49 AM] WILCOX Robin A

TSAP also has an amendment in play right now for the Vulnerable Road User index

[10:50 AM] BOLEN Glen A

---

**Small note - under the 366.215 description, please add "geometric" or something similar before the word capacity**

[10:51 AM] BOLEN Glen A

perhaps dimensional

[10:51 AM] BOLEN Glen A

Capacity within 366 doesn't include the numbers of vehicles, just the size - a common misconception

[10:52 AM] BOLEN Glen A

**Good point - use the word Centers for Metro**

like 1

[10:52 AM] CONLEY Theresa L

**Would an \* at the header help, Joseph? With the \* clarifying that Town Centers are included under CFAs?**

[10:54 AM] Joseph Auth

**Town Centers are not under CFAs. I need to think of how can we say Portland Metro Regional and Town Centers in fewer words.**

[10:55 AM] WILCOX Robin A

Do you care what format our comments are in? Would you prefer we add comments to the PDF?

[10:56 AM] WILCOX Robin A

Interpretive dance it is 😊

laugh 1 like 1

[10:56 AM] WILCOX Robin A

Thanks, Theresa!

[10:57 AM] WILCOX Robin A

(I'll write them)

[10:57 AM]

Lisa Scherf - City of Corvallis (Guest) left the chat.

[10:57 AM]

10:57 AM Meeting ended: 2h 2m 32s Attendance