

Transportation Planning Guides Update

TSP Guidelines Technical Advisory Committee (TSP-TAC) Meeting #6

May 30, 2024 | 1:00 – 3:00 PM

Microsoft Teams Meeting: [Join the meeting now](#)

Attend.	Name	Org.	Attend.	Name	Org.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Theresa Conley	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karen Buehrig	Clackamas County
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Zachary Horowitz	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Julie Hanson	City of Salem
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Michael Baker	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Joseph Auth	City of Hillsboro
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lisa Cornutt	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Susie Wright	Kittelson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Glen Bolen	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Matt Bell	Kittelson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Dejan Dudich	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Darci Rudzinski	MIG
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ken Shonkwiler	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eric Hesse	PBOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Eilene Cunningham	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clark Goldenrod	PBOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alexis Bocanegra	ODOT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Francesca Jones	PBOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bill Holmstrom	DLCD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bryan Graveline	PBOT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lisa Scherf	City of Corvallis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Emma Land	OHA

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of TSP-TAC Meeting #6 is to provide an overview of the updated TSP Guidelines website and get feedback on areas where additional guidance is needed.

Agenda:

1. Project Overview and Status Update (10 min)
2. Summary of Edits since last meeting (20 min)
 - a. <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Planning/TSP-Guidelines/Pages/default.aspx>
3. Resources
 - a. [Primer on Performance-Based Planning for TSPs in Metropolitan Areas Overview](#) (30 min)
4. Discussion (30 min)
 - a. What areas do you still have questions about?
 - b. Does the revised guidance provide the clarity you need?
 - c. For future updates, what areas would you like additional guidance?
5. Next Steps (10 min)
 - a. Online training materials
 - b. Practitioner webinars

Notes:

1. Project updates

-
- a. Susie provided an update on the project and Matt summarized key changes to the guidelines based on input from the TAC, DLCD, and others.
 2. Performance-Based Planning Factsheet
 - a. Susie provided an overview of the performance-based planning factsheet that is now available on the TSP Guidelines website.
 - b. Ven Diagram
 - i. TAC – Graphic causes more confusion than it helps. The definitions section helps.
 1. Theresa – The venn diagram had several iterations. We could change the wording in the box: “Some measures can be used for either”.
 - ii. Ken – The graphic works, but I have trouble understanding the threshold portion and why it matters. Why do we need the threshold? (3rd graphic).
 1. Susan – Threshold says what you are trying to achieve, identifies what is acceptable and what is not.
 - a. Ken – The example shows the threshold under the target and threshold.
 - b. Susan – Target is at system level, while the threshold is at facility level.
 - iii. Joseph – In Metro, they are responsible for -0905 and -0910. This makes it look like cities and counties are still responsible for it. Second, it makes it seem like whatever performance measure or target they create, we must develop standards related to it. I thought there would be more autonomy.
 1. Susan – The TSP needs to be supportive of achieving the measures and targets, performance standards don’t come from the -0905 measures, but they need to support them.
 2. Joseph – The example makes it seem like if Metro uses LTS, then we will have to use LTS thresholds and standards, when we should be able to create our own.
 3. Susan – I can see how you see that. They don’t have to be one in the same. We can clarify that.
 4. Joseph – maybe include a separate example where the measure is not the same.
 - iv. Eric – It is important to clarify that the rules are intended to apply at different levels. They are not going to necessarily be the same, going to have to tease out the differences in measures and standards.
 1. Susan – Standards come down to local application, land use and development applications.
 2. Eric – I’m thinking about how the regional mobility policy interfaces here, particularly around land use, amendments pieces, what policy does not apply to. You might not want to use the same measures – TSP versus development applications.

-
- v. Susan – The TPR is making sure land use and transportation plans are coordinated, -0215 should apply to TSPs and land use decisions. Traditionally development codes reference the same standards for TSPs, TPR analysis, and development review but development review could have different standards. The TPR doesn't dictate this but there should be a connection between how you review development and the performance standards in the TSP.
 - vi. Glen – OHP guidance – encourage cities and counties to include what is reasonable and likely.
 - vii. Eric – You might want to have a system standard and a standard that applies at the facility level. Show through lines, not have to be explicitly the same.
 - 1. Susie – Then what do you ultimately include in your code? The TPR is not mandating what you do in development review process.
 - 2. Susie – 215 still applies and needs to be supportive of measures from Metro.
 - viii. Zachary – Joseph and Bill verified in the chat that -0905 and -0910 do not apply to jurisdictions within Metro.
- c. Toolkit of Measures
 - i. Glen – We should consider connections between the transportation network and land use and look at the elasticities; things that cause people to not drive. We could also see transit access to work.
 - d. Prioritization
 - i. Joseph – We have a lot of concerns about prioritization during rulemaking. If a project is ranked number one, we don't have to construct it first above other projects.
 - 1. Susie – We can clarify that the TSP prioritization does not require implementation order. It is communicating what the community priorities are, what you can consider constrained versus unconstrained, but not what happens first.
 - 2. Joseph – We are working with PSU to refine bicycle projects. We tell them we want to drop this segment because we know that adjacent property will be redeveloped. We still need to have those identified in the TSP (constrained or unconstrained), want to clarify the level of flexibility that the rules have on prioritization, which projects go first.
 - 3. Joseph – We should still make efforts to ensure the TSP and CIP reflect each other.
 - 4. Susie – You should be able to describe to the public and your decision makers why the CIP does not always match the top priority projects in the TSP.
 - ii. Theresa – There is a fair amount of flexibility in prioritization and what the framework looks like, and the new interpretation about how to apply -0155 as a planning tool. We interpret it as flexible.

1. Bill – It has quite a bit of flexibility – one factor is will we be able to do the project through other means – in terms of funding.
 - iii. Karen – Appreciate the information, but does this make it clearer? I still have questions about how this process will work, more than how it is described in the TSP guidelines. It would be nice to have that at some time. One question I have is around transit system prioritization factors. We’re not a transit system provider, how does something that is out of our control fit into this project list. Also, it looks like each mode is prioritized separately, but we also need a combined list.
 1. Susie – You need an unconstrained list that combines all modal projects.
 2. Karen – What about the financially-constrained list.
 3. Theresa – Should we add a step 4?
 4. Susie – Yes, we can add that.
 5. Matt – We can also clarify that step 1 includes evaluating solutions based on -0155
 - iv. Eric – It would be useful to clarify that the rule does not preclude the use of programmatic funds – funds that go to lots of projects.
 - v. Theresa – I had a similar question about TO projects. We should be able to incorporate programmatic projects into the constrained list.
3. Safety Factsheet
- a. Matt provided an overview of the Safety Factsheet, which identifies how to integrate traffic safety considerations into each phase and stop of the planning process.
4. General Discussion
- a. Karen – I haven’t looked through the latest draft, but I’m hoping for some sort of callouts or unique applications for Metro.
 - i. Susie – We don’t have an overall summary for cities and counties in Metro versus non-Metro; however, wherever the rules distinguish things, we’ve tried to incorporate that where we could. That said, there are still some questions.
 - ii. Susie – Metro will be updating the RTFP, which will provide additional guidance.
 1. Eric – Will share some interaction with Kim.
 2. Susie – If there are some nuanced distinctions that should be updated, we can do that.
 - b. Theresa – Targeting the end of June for the webinar. TSP guidelines is a living document, and ODOT is always interested in hearing about it. We already have eyes on sections that need to be updated. Always open to feedback.

Action Items

1. Clarify language in the Venn Diagram that some measures can be used as standards.
2. Clarify in the example graphic that the Target is at a system level while the threshold is at a facility level **OR** add a second example graphic that uses a separate measure for the standard and target.
3. Clarify that you don’t have to use the same measures for development review as your TSP.
4. Clarify that the TSP prioritization does not require jurisdictions to implement projects in order.

5. Include a discussion on evaluating and selecting preferred solutions into Prioritization Framework Step 1.
6. Include a Prioritization Framework Step 4 that addresses the financially-constrained project list
7. Clarify that programmatic funds and funds for TO and other programs may still be included in financially-constrained plans.
8. Review references to Metro and ensure guidance is clear about who is required to do what.

Next Steps

1. TSP Guidelines – Please provide any outstanding comments on the TSP Guidelines ASAP.
2. Fact Sheets – Please provide any outstanding comments on the factsheets ASAP.
3. Webinar – We are targeting the end of June for a Webinar on the TSP Guidelines (scheduled for June 17th)
4. Training Materials – We are currently developing training materials for ODOT staff that provide guidance on critical elements of the TPR

Meeting Chat:

[5/30 1:09 PM] BOLEN Glen A

Does "scoping" mean developing the statement of work, or "scoping" capital projects?

[5/30 1:09 PM] BOLEN Glen A

I assume the prior

[5/30 1:09 PM] CONLEY Theresa L

Scoping for a TSP

[5/30 1:09 PM] Susan Wright (External)

Scoping the TSP

[5/30 1:23 PM] HOROWITZ Zachary

Possibly an easier to understand rule 0905 measure is: "Number of households engaged with Transportation Options activities."

[5/30 1:24 PM] HOROWITZ Zachary

or "Number of publicly supported affordable housing units in climate-friendly areas."

[5/30 1:27 PM] CONLEY Theresa L

Joseph Auth please jump in to this quick 'round robin' if your Q is on this same topic!

[5/30 1:28 PM] BOLEN Glen A

In the teal circle, I might be getting sidetracked by the first bullet using the word "measure" since it is both a noun and a verb in this parlance

[5/30 1:29 PM] Hesse, Eric (External)

To our read, the Standards are distinct from the other Performance Measures insofar as we are using these as an approval criterion in land use plan amendments and site-level approvals, which is different from the others that are monitoring performance towards other targets but aren't as "decisive". Is that the intent?

[5/30 1:29 PM] CONLEY Theresa L

We can box or use color coding similar to the Venn Diagram to 'pair' the definitions in the example?

[5/30 1:32 PM] Hesse, Eric (External)

I am also assuming Metro is likely directly drawing from or building upon what is currently being monitored in RTP Appendix J for Climate Smart Communities monitoring. I wrote Kim Ellis at Metro to confirm this, but haven't heard back.

[5/30 1:33 PM] CONLEY Theresa L

Easy to navigate version of the TPR, if anyone wants to review those -0905 measures:
https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/CL/Documents/TPR_2023.pdf

[5/30 1:33 PM] HOROWITZ Zachary

OAR 660-012-0910(1) states: Cities, counties, and Metro must set performance targets for each reporting year for each performance measure provided in OAR 660-044-0110 and OAR 660-012-0905 in their local transportation system plan. (emphasis mine)

[5/30 1:36 PM] CONLEY Theresa L

Would it be helpful to have another example - one that illustrates how a standard can 'support' the -905 measures while being different from each other?

[5/30 1:38 PM] Joseph Auth (External)

HOROWITZ Zachary (External)

OAR 660-012-0910(1) states: Cities, counties, and Metro must set performance targets for each reporting year for each performance measure provided in OAR 660-044-0110 and OAR 660-012-0905 in their local transportation system plan. (emphasis mine) I verified with DLCD. 910(1) does not apply to cities and counties within Metro. I can share the email with DLCD.