



MEETING SUMMARY

TPR MODELING AND ANALYSIS GUIDES UPDATE

OMSC WORK GROUP MEETING #5

MAY 21, 2023; 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

VIRTUAL MEETING

1. PROJECT TEAM INTRODUCTIONS/ AGENDA OVERVIEW

2:00

- Project team introductions
- Review agenda and meeting purpose

2. CFA CASE STUDIES

2:10

Garth Appanaitis provided context about the case studies and how they fit into the guidance development process.

- Zachary Horowitz – We focused on the elements that we determined would most likely move the needle (on VMT) within travel demand models.

Aaron Berger summarized key highlights from the Milwaukie case study.

- Zachary Horowitz – Reminder: Climate-friendly areas (CFA) within the Metro region are the 2040 Centers
- Zachary Horowitz – Household size distribution was previously identified as an important characteristic of trip-making, and was determined to be worth reviewing for accuracy and revision (as needed)
 - Nick Meltzer - Appreciate the attention paid to housing allocation via the land use step as it has so many impacts down model and is also likely the biggest unknown for CFAs (besides employment).
 - Zachary Horowitz - One thing we've learned from this work is that during TSP development, there should be sufficient time allocated to collaborate with city/county planners to identify the latest and best housing/employment forecasts (and time to iterate) in order to build in the best input data into the models. Not rocket science, to be fair, but a refinement to add additional rigorousness to the previously process.

- Nick Meltzer - did we do any sensitivity analysis to test different land use allocations to see if more of a shift would have more impact?
 - Aaron - no, just a single scenario
- Garth Appanaitis - Just to clarify the VMT/capita discussion, it includes all VMT related to homes in Milwaukie - distances traveled in Milwaukie, distance travelled in other areas in Metro, and distance travelled external to the Metro model (using SWIM)
- Garth Appanaitis - The "2040 CFA" scenario described there does not have the additional sensitivity test that we conducted by adding additional multimodal connectors
- Garth Appanaitis - As Ray noted in his review, those external trips are LONG and do impact the calculations
- Zachary Horowitz - Does that external VMT change much between 2015 and 2040? say, as a percentage of the total VMT?
 - Aaron Berger – There is some variation, but external trips comprise around a third of total VMT and is a large portion in all cases.
- Garth Appanaitis - The SWIM data would have been applied to estimate how far people traveled that left on I-5 south of Wilsonville (the Metro model extent) or east of Troutdale, etc.
- Ray - Need to clarify the UGB vs the City limits for what is calculated and what is required for the rules.
 - Zachary - That's a good flag. There needs to be some guidance on the procedure to align TAZs to UGB limits (which is the right geographic area to consider)
- Ray - Wants to use SWIM only outside the MPO boundary -
- Tara Weidner – The new HH-based VMT definition seems to do a much better job of scaling down and showing impact at the jurisdictional level in contrast to link-based VMT definition

Teddy Lin summarized key highlights from the Ashland case study

- Zachary - was there a differentiation on the type of employment that was assigned to the CFA?
 - Teddy - Did not change the employment type or break down from the existing assumptions. Growth was applied at a similar rate to all employment categories.
- Martin Mann - Was the employment growth assumed to be all growth, or the planning horizon?
 - Teddy - Started with the RTP and adjusted from there.

- Teddy - The 2045 CFA scenario would still have more employment than the base year, even outside the CFA
- Ray Jackson - What are the transit assumptions in the Rogue Valley model that led to such a large jump in transit use?
 - Jin Ren - The Transit Plan Master plan was adopted and includes a lot of transit improvements. The transit plan is being expanded substantially. The transit study was adopted in 2018. Was put in the model for the RTP.
- Jin - Table 6 and 8 typos (should be 2045 RTP rather than 2027 RTP). Populations will stay the same, but the households would change. Jin suggests doing another check.

General Discussion

- Zachary Horowitz - Do modelers feel equipped to begin the TSP update process?
- Ray Jackson - A couple items that jumped out in addition to the externals. How will the cities reach the 30% target for households within CFAs as required by the rules?
 - Tara Weidner - the 30% is based on the zoning capacity that could be accommodated. The areas will have a performance measure to track progress.
- Ray Jackson - both test cases were done in a vacuum with a multi-jurisdiction reality. Is guidance for all the CFAs needed so that no population is stolen from other areas. Not sure if we need guidance, or best practice with how to deal with multiple CFAs going on at the same time.
 - Zachary Horowitz – Population Research Center (PRC) at PSU sets the population and Metro also coordinates this within the Metro area. This question probably can't be answered through this project.
 - Tara Weidner - This is how change happens, and it can be messy. That region conversation happens with the RTPs. Maybe as part of the RTP that is when you open the regional box.
- Nick Meltzer - Thinks it will be helpful to continue to communicate that this will require iterative updates. Knowing how the trends would go (sensitivity test) would be interesting.
- Nick Meltzer - the assumption for the density in the CFAs and minimum density in the rules may be what has used for Ashland.
 - Kim Sapunar - Due to size Ashland would probably have the lower threshold for density.
 - Nick Meltzer – This gets back to the importance of market analysis and the assumptions.

- Jin Ren - Need to distinguish the definition for VMT/capita. The MPO measurement used to be much different.
- Kim Sapunar - What would be helpful is where the sensitivity may lie. Prioritization of what would make a difference. TAZ boundaries and CFA boundaries?
- Martin Mann - In particular with the trip-based models, where the boundaries don't match, the effect of including a TAZ that is just "barely in" may not reflect some of the inputs for the CFA (e.g., accessibility) - there may be a benefit of zone splitting. Also, might be able to use some proportional treatments like he worked through in South Corvallis

3. FOCUSED DISCUSSION ON GUIDANCE

3:10

- Ray Jackson - VMT write up is very complicated - part of it is Metro specific. Would like to see guidance on a simpler external trip method. The non-home based trips that are leaving the City seems to be a stumbling block. Is it worth the effort to come up with something that is close enough, vs. good, vs. perfect. Maybe something for future conversations - not sure to what degree can be tackled as part of the existing guidance.
- Tara Weidner - None of these scenarios include any change to the auto-operating cost, which would help meet the goals by further supporting the modeled land use and non-driving mode investments.
- Nick Meltzer - with STIF funding, many transit agencies are realizing their long range plans much sooner than anticipated.
 - Ray Jackson - True, but there isn't enough STIF funding for RVTD to realize that level of service.
 - RVMPO's 2045 Long-term RTP is not financially constrained but its short-term RTP is.
- Tara Weidner - Another consideration since the CFAs are smaller outside of Metro...instead/in addition could report output for those TAZs with a minimum population density or "mixed use" place type; a broader data-driven geography that is likely larger than the CFA areas. "Mixed use" areas have impact larger than just the single parcel development.
 - Nick Meltzer - it might be worth cross-referencing with the rules. They are wonky to say the least. You can have all residential, you can have first floor commercial only, and you can have one-story townhomes. but if you have

residential you need to have first floor commercial. So it's a crapshoot what will be built

- Tyler Deke - One issue in our area - reallocating HH/Emp will be challenging. About 80% of UGB areas have been annexed and have approved master plans. I don't think the City can restrict development in those areas. Without new control totals, I think some of our CFA land use assumption options will be limited.
- Nick Meltzer - we found the same issue. in Albany/Corvallis to accommodate 30% of households, that means all growth in the next 20 years should (key should) be in CFAs

4. OVERVIEW OF TM#10 PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS APPLICATION GUIDANCE

3:35

With limited time remaining Garth Appanaitis provided a very brief overview on TM#10.

5. NEXT STEPS

3:55

Last meeting with the group. Asked to provide comments by the end of the month.