



MEETING SUMMARY

TPR MODELING AND ANALYSIS GUIDES UPDATE

TAC MEETING #4

MAY 22, 2024; 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

VIRTUAL MEETING

Attendees: Zachary Horowitz, Jennifer Garbely, Aaron Brooks, Steve Kelley, Peter Schuytema, Jody Trendler, Theresa Conley, Kevin Young, Cody Meyer, Kelly Clarke, Alex Bettinardi, Tara Weidner, Neelam Dorman

1. PROJECT TEAM INTRODUCTIONS/ AGENDA OVERVIEW

9:00

- Project team introductions
- Review agenda and meeting purpose

2. OVERVIEW OF TM#10 PERFORMANCE MEASURE AND PERFORMANCE STANDARD APPLICATION GUIDANCE

9:05

- Garth Appanaitis provided an overview of TM#10 and summary of feedback received from the APMUG presentation.
- Theresa Conley – The Rules and TSP Guidelines refer to ‘Performance Standards’ (Measure + Threshold) – how will these materials crosswalk with that terminology?
 - Zachary - need to be consistent with the rules, but also make it understandable for application and what has been used previously
 - Zachary - the TSP guideline effort is developing a detailed fact sheet
- Cody Meyer – There could be challenges for collecting SDCs. Are transit operations an eligible improvement? How do you enforce it over time? How would it be set up if you don't have a transit agency in your city?
- Cody Meyer - would like to see a more balanced approach to mitigation options. Maybe demand management strategies to mitigate for the volume side of V/C

- Cody Meyer - Can VMT be on a project level? Have a higher bar for mitigation. Would like to see something that helps change the direction of where we are going. With California SB 743, how do we stop encouraging development on the edges?
- Christina McDaniel-Wilson - one quick comment for the pedestrian and bicycle risk, the Vulnerable Road User Assessment work was published in November of last year, might be good to point to this work instead of the Ped/Bike Safety Implementation plan. [Oregon Department of Transportation : Transportation Safety Action Plan : Safety : State of Oregon](#)
- Neelam Dorman - confirming that a local agency would be able define how a measure is applied. It will be helpful to hear from the local agencies about what is needed as we get into implementation.
 - Zachary – TM#10 is focused on local measures. The OHP update will tackle this for state facilities.
- Cody Meyer - I like where Alex is going on SDC charges, that would create a clearer and more objective pathway.
 - Zachary Horowitz - Regarding elements like SDC charges - I believe there are so many financial and legal components of that process that are beyond the "technical" aspects of this performance standard work. Nevertheless, those are highly important considerations that local cities and counties need to connect to performance standards. I know, as an example, even the City of Portland (among other locales) have wrestled with determining proportionality of impact based on v/c or LOS for years now, without much finality. Not an easy problem to solve.

Example 1: Big Development near city boundary - Discussion

Cody Meyer - Because it is at the local agency to select the two measures, doesn't have to be VMT.

- Alex Bettinardi - Good to address pros and cons for each measure.
- Alex Bettinardi - Would like to see a litmus test of if there is core vs fringe development impacts? Alex thinks that this should be a basic lens.
- Peter Schuytema - Many of these measures may be easier to apply to TSP existing/future/build conditions than applying them to development review. Measure choice for development review should be looked at carefully as implementation challenges could occur later (e.g., data, tools, legal)

- Steve Kelley - first thing that popped into his head was a UGB expansion in Sherwood that would include a commercial use on the edge related to tourism.
- Cody - The TPR includes a requirement for VMT/capita.
- Alex Bettinardi - I keep thinking about Bend. Doesn't Bend have a simple schedule: <https://www.bendoregon.gov/government/departments/community-development/online-permit-center/development-services/system-development-charges>
- Cody - How do we set clear and objective standards? This is an important consideration that local agencies will face.
 - Christina McDaniel-Wilson - what would be the best way to estimate the VMT for the SDC charges, would that be the ITE Trip Generation Manual?
 - Alex Bettinardi - I think VMT could be simple formula like Cody suggested - maybe with discount elements
 - Garth – Different requirements in California to address, but agencies take up entire efforts to set up a methodology for estimating VMT, which is complex because it expands the variables to consider not only the size and type of use, but also the location.
- Alex Bettinardi - I think a city could move away from modeling / analysis altogether. I think ODOT is having a hard time thinking about this because we have used V/C for so long, but we don't have to do that level of review for developments...
- Peter Schuytema - May be helpful to have some sort of scaling/objective table in the final documentation for the measures to help guide choice

Example 2 – Roundabout vs. Traffic Signal

- Christina McDaniel-Wilson - run into this challenge in general. Roundabouts are expensive and take ROW. Should also look at community input, funding, freight route needs? For ARTS – look at does it improve safety, does authority agree with you. Beyond reducing fatal and serious injury crashes, are also practical that if there are things beyond the control they may be difficult to implement. Need to consider more things. For example, funding should be a consideration.

- Garth Appanaitis provided an overview of the CFA Case Studies and comments received from the OMSC presentation.
- Cody Meyer - were the Design Ds incorporated?
 - Garth – Yes, looked at accessibility considerations to mimic better ped connections via modifying TAZ connectors as part of the Milwaukie case study.
- Cody Meyer - was parking pricing isolated?
 - No
- Cody Meyer - wants to provide more than just the recommendation in modeling guidance. People need to know what the ingredients and menu of options are needed.
 - Zachary - that is noted and recognized that both the coordination time is needed, but also the information
- Cody Meyer - he would be more bullish assuming that an adjacent zone would have similar travel behavior, even if not within a CFA.
- Alex Bettinardi - Sorry, my brain won't stop thinking about the challenge Cody put in front of us - How cool would it be if the development charge was set on something simple based on how many additional parking spots (or parking potential - street frontage) are being added. That would be a really interesting / simple way to set charges... Or maybe just based on how much ground surface is being added for vehicles (parking lots, roads...). Set the charge based on how many sqft of pavement is being added by the development...
- Zachary Horowitz - One thing we've learned from this work is that during a TSP development, there should be sufficient time allocated to collaborate with city/county planners to identify the latest and best housing/employment forecasts and parking info (and time to iterate) 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 previous process. I made the above comment to yesterday's OMSC Working Group meeting, and there was positive reception of taking the additional time to collaborate and bring in the latest/greatest early in the TSP process to allow the models to best reflect the proposed future conditions
 - Theresa Conley - We are integrating these steps into the TSP Guidelines and TSP SOW template - additional coordination with TPAU/Region Traffic

- Provide comments by the end of the month